

731 h 33

A N
A N S W E R
T O A
P A M P H L E T,
E N T I T L E D
Pietas Oxoniensis,
I N A
LETTER to the AUTHOR.

W H E R E I N

The Grounds of the Expulsion of Six Members
from *St. Edmund-Hall* are set forth; and the
Doctrines of the Church of *England*, and its first
Reformers, fully considered, and vindicated.

By THOMAS NOWELL, D. D.
PRINCIPAL of *St. Mary Hall*, and PUBLIC ORATOR of
the University of OXFORD.

The S E C O N D E D I T I O N,
With large Additions, and a POSTSCRIPT, occasioned by
THE REPLY of the same Author.

O X F O R D,
At the CLARENDON-PRESS. MDCCLXIX.
Sold by DANIEL PRINCE.
And by John Rivington in *St. Paul's Church-yard*, London.

Imprimatur,

N. WETHERELL,

Vice-Can. OXON.

Jan. 5. 1769.

39
7 5
68



S I R,

THE act of discipline exercised upon six members of St. *Edmund-Hall* by the Vice-Chancellor, in consequence of a solemn appeal made to him, as Visitor of that Hall, however commendable in itself, and pleasing to the true friends of learning and religion, yet could not fail to draw upon him, and his assessors, the indignation and resentment of a set of men, who are enemies to both. Their views of filling the church with their votaries have by this seasonable interposition been disappointed; and the plan, which they have for some time been labouring to accomplish, is at present disconcerted at least, if not entirely defeated. The rage of their disappointment has vented itself in the common News-papers in foul invectives, and railing accusations; which, as they carry with them their own confutation, are best treated with neglect, and passed over in silence.

THE first who undertook to patronize their cause by a formal defence was the Rev. Mr. *Whitefield*; and certainly it was very proper that HE should be their advocate, who may be justly reputed the leader of their sect; that HE should be their champion, under whose banner they are enlisted. I confess it gave me sensible pleasure to see him step forward in their vindication, as it strongly marks the complexion and characters of these young men,

A

discovers

discovers the principles by which they are actuated, and must convince the sober part of mankind of the propriety and expedience of that censure, which they have incurred. With this observation I leave his performance to the admiration of those, whose applause it courts, whose sentiments it flatters, and for whose judgment and taste it is calculated. Neither should I have thought myself obliged to pay any regard to what you have advanced either in favour of them, or to the prejudice of the Vice-Chancellor and his assessors, had you brought only a general charge against them, and been contented to complain of the severity, or even iniquity of a sentence, by which you may fancy the Church will be deprived of so many godly teachers, and yourself perhaps of the fruit of your labours.

BUT since you have thought proper to fix a particular charge of ^a dissimulation and prevarication on the Vice-Chancellor; of ^b partiality, impertinence, and want of integrity, on me; as well as the general one of cruelty, oppression, and injustice, on all; silence may now be interpreted into a confession of guilt; a regard therefore to our private characters, thus openly attacked, and personally vilified, requires that a charge so injurious to our reputation should be as publicly refuted. Though this may effectually be done by barely stating the facts alleged against us, placing them in their true light, and clearing them from the artful misrepresentations by which You have dis-

^a P. 8.

^b P. 64, 85.

guised them; yet for the satisfaction of the public, who have been greatly abused, and imposed upon by your “full and impartial account,” I chuse to enter more largely into the subject, and to attend you through the whole progress of your work; from a fair examination of which the world will be able to judge “^a how far these six members have, or have not, deserved the punishment inflicted upon them;” and whether in the defence of their cause you have been guided by that “^b Spirit of wisdom, truth, love, and candor,” by which alone you profess to be actuated. And if I enter into a discussion of the doctrinal points, it is with a view to bring back to the profession of the true faith those deluded persons, who are now carried away with every wind of vain doctrine by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness whereby they lie in wait to deceive.

To begin with your dedication.—Had your book been written in defence of the established rules and ordinances of the church of *England*, or in support of the laws and discipline of the University of *Oxford*, you might with the greatest propriety and confidence have dedicated it to the protection and patronage of the Chancellor; whose illustrious character, distinguished abilities, and zealous attachment to the true interests of both, reflect the highest honour on himself, and these ancient seats of learning and religion, over which he presides. — But to solicit his patronage and protection, while you

^a Dedic. vi.

^b P. 2.

are undermining his authority, and exposing to ridicule and contempt the venerable body, over which he presides; to claim the sanction of his name, in order to fix a mark of infamy on those, who have acted by his commission, and with his approbation. — What is this but to tread in the steps of the old puritans, who most dutifully addressed the King, and made the most solemn professions of loyalty and obedience to his person and government, while they were meditating the destruction of both? Nor is it to be wondered at that you should imitate the conduct of men, whose principles you have adopted, and whose tenets you so strenuously maintain.

AFTER this very extraordinary address to the Chancellor, you proceed to inform his Lordship, “^a that however the late sentence may have the appearance of an University-Act, yet it is the highest injustice to that ancient and respectable seminary of true piety and learning to look upon it in this light.” The Chancellor was before too well acquainted with the nature and circumstances of the whole proceeding to want this information: Nor is there any danger that “^b it may pass for such in history, when children’s children shall read the dire account,” unless they are misled by your misrepresentation of it. For it was never pretended to be an University-Act; to constitute it such, it must have had the sanction of convocation, to which this complaint was not, nor indeed could

^a Dedic. P. v.

^b Ibid.

with any propriety be submitted. The depositions of Mr. *Higson* were made before the Vice-Chancellor as Visitor of *Edmund-Hall*, and he pronounced the sentence by his visitatorial authority, in which capacity alone he acted by the advice of the Heads of Houses, and with the assistance of three of them, to whom was afterwards added the then senior Proctor. That I happened to be one of that number was not the effect of my own inclination, or the Vice-Chancellor's appointment, but merely in compliance with the request of Dr. *Dixon*, for whom, notwithstanding the illiberal treatment I have met with on his account, I have the sincerest regard; and who, I am persuaded, when he desired me to appear on that occasion, never meant that my friendship for him should warp my judgment, or influence my determination: and on the other hand I solemnly declare that no motives but those of truth and justice; no affection, but for the welfare of the Church and University, directed my opinion, and determined my sentiments. Nor do I apprehend that any "a great and eminent men" in the University have testified their disapprobation of what was then done;" but on the contrary have reason to believe that had all the Heads of Houses, and every man of eminence in the University been present, they would have confirmed the sentence by their unanimous voice. I farther declare that in a conversation with the Principal sometime before the visitation, He assured me that, if any of the young men accused appeared to be

a Dedic. P. v.

improper members of his society, though he gave them all a good character, he should readily acquiesce in their removal. Had he not given me this assurance, I should certainly have declined an invidious office, in which friendship and duty could not be united, but must one of them be sacrificed to the other.

WHAT I have here said of myself, may with equal truth be applied to the Provost of *Queen's*, who also became one of the assessors by the desire of *Dr. Dixon*, in consequence of a long intimacy and friendship which had subsisted between them; and who, as patron of *Edmund-Hall*, was himself interested in the honour and reputation of it, and could not therefore be supposed to be desirous of bringing any of its members into disgrace, or fixing any stigma or opprobrium on them, but what they should appear upon examination to deserve. To these the Vice-Chancellor thought fit to add the President of *Corpus Christi College*, his senior Pro-Vice-Chancellor, and *Lady Margaret's* Professor of Divinity, and one who had always lived in the greatest friendship and intimacy with *Dr. Dixon*. The President was sensible this might be an invidious office, and would willingly have declined it: but being pressed by the Vice-Chancellor to give him his assistance, he thought he could not with decency refuse it. He had no connections, nor acquaintance, with *Mr. Higson*, but entered on this office with strong inclinations to favour the Principal, as far as truth and justice would permit.

LET

LET me add that, from some circumstances which happened at a previous meeting in the Principal's lodgings, the Vice-Chancellor and his assessors had conceived rather an unfavourable opinion of Mr. *Higson's* cause, which nothing but the force of evidence produced at the examination could have altered.

I cannot dismiss this point without commending the candor of the Vice-Chancellor, who permitted the Principal himself ^a to nominate two out of the three assessors, who were at first appointed to assist him; the fourth was, as I before observed, added afterwards at the request of Mr. *Higson*, who had ungenerously expressed some apprehensions of partiality in the other assessors to the cause of the Principal.

YOU conclude this dedication with declaring that "you have been particularly careful not to

^a In your reply you deny that Dr. *Dixon* had the original "appointment of any of the assessors." But he has acknowledged, in a conference at the present Vice-Chancellor's lodgings, that he did request the late Vice-Chancellor to appoint the Provost of *Queen's* College and myself to be of that number. And declared farther, that, had he been to chuse for himself, he could not have fixed upon four persons, of whom he entertained a higher opinion, than the Principal of *Hertford*, the President of C. C. C. the Provost of *Queen's*, and the Principal of *St. Mary Hall*. But I shall not detain the reader at present with Dr. *Dixon's* sentiments, as I shall have occasion to speak more fully on the subject of that conference in my postscript.

assert

“ assert any thing upon hear-say evidence, but
 “ have taken much pains to trace up every cir-
 “ cumstance and fact you have alleged to the
 “ fountain-head.” The truth or falshood of this
 declaration will best appear from an examination
 of your “ full and impartial account” &c. to
 “ which I now hasten.

YOU preface this account with professions of
 the highest veneration for the doctrine and
 discipline “^a of the established Church, into whose
 “ communion you were in your infancy baptized,
 “ and whose cause, ^b together with that of violated
 “ truth, trampled laws, and injured innocence, you
 “ now mean to defend.” When you made these
 professions, you would have done well to have
 considered the nature and importance of them.
 Your veneration for the doctrine and discipline
 of the Church of *England*, had it been real, would
 not have permitted you to advance tenets so con-
 trary to the one, and subversive of the other, or
 to defend those who have been convicted of acting
 in contradiction to both — You would not have
 violated that truth, for which you pretend to be
 an advocate; or have trampled on those laws,
 you are by the most solemn obligations bound to
 observe. — You would not have injured that inno-
 cence in others, which you falsely attribute to
 those, whose guilt became notorious by their own
 confession, and the clearest evidence.

^a P. 1.

^b P. 2.

“ ^a As to the six members expelled from “ *Edmund-Hall*,” you say, “ I had very little acquaintance with any of them, and some of them “ were totally unknown to me till after the sentence was passed, so that I am in less danger of “ partiality on that ^b account.” I beg, Sir, that you would recollect whether some of these young men had not attended the meetings of a person with whom you are intimately connected? were not his disciples? Whether they did not all of them assemble at his chambers soon after their expulsion? — which probably was the fountain-head from whence you derived your intelligence, and where the plan of your defence was concerted. Whether therefore from all these considerations their cause may not in some measure be deemed your own? and whether there was not consequently some danger of partiality on that account? Not to mention the undue influence you lie under from a blind attachment to your sect, which discovers itself in every page of your book.

You next invoke the graces of “ ^c wisdom, “ truth, love, and candor,” which you seem to introduce here only to take your leave of them;

^a P. 2.

^b Yet it appears from your REPLY that you were so much interested in the cause, that you held a correspondence with them, and were particularly informed of every thing that passed from the first meeting at the Principal's Lodgings to the day of the examination.

^c P. 2.

for

for scarce any ^a footsteps of either of them are to be found in any subsequent part of your work.

WHAT ^b passed between the Principal and Mr. *Higson*, before he had made his complaint to the Vice-Chancellor; what may be Mr. *Higson*'s ^c natural disposition; what disorders of body or mind he may have laboured under; or what differences may have subsisted between the Principal and him, are secrets which I have no right to pry into, as they no way relate to the present question. And I think your representation of some of these particulars is equally impertinent and uncharitable. Are you acquainted with Mr. *Higson*? do you know him to be of “ a proud revengeful disposition?” or have you given this character of him upon hearsay evidence? The charge of insanity is still more cruel, and your feigned pity the greatest insult. Nor am I at all concerned to enquire whether Mr. *Higson* acted of himself; or was made, what you term him, “ ^d the tool or cat's-paw of others “ to perpetrate what, through shame or fear, they “ durst not undertake themselves;” tho' I am inclined from his own declaration upon oath to believe the former; and that he was induced to it from a sense of the disgrace brought upon that so-

^a You are very angry with me for this representation of your work. But Dr. *Dixon* acknowledged the truth of it, and told you “ that the spirit in which it was written could “ do no service to your cause.”

^b P. 2.

^c P. 3.

^d P. 4.

ciety

ciety by the admission of persons totally unfit to become members of the University.

THE affection of a Tutor for his pupils naturally prejudices him in their favour, and will prevail on him rather to conceal than expose their failings and imperfections, where he can do it consistently with the principles of duty and conscience — While a regard to his own interest, as well as theirs, will not easily suffer him to sacrifice both either to his own private resentment, or the malevolent suggestions of others; much less to become without the greatest necessity their public accuser. But whatever were his motives, I am convinced that neither the Vice-Chancellor, nor his assessors were in the least degree influenced by them, or by any other ^a consideration than that of truth, and the honour and welfare of the University. They therefore heartily despise the insinuation of their being ^b led and influenced by a mad-man to pass, what you call, ^c the most cruel “and ignominious sentence which can possibly be “inflicted by the University;” into the merits of which we come now to enquire.

BUT before you proceed to the particular charges, you loudly complain of the most unprecedented, illegal, and arbitrary proceedings,—viz.—“ ^d that “all the witnesses against the parties accused were

^a Your insinuation that they had been tampered with will be fully answered in my postscript.

^b P. 4.

^c P. 68.

^d P. 5.

“ examined

“ examined without being put to their oath, except
 “ one, a very worthy conscientious man, who was
 “ justly supposed to be their friend ; that not only
 “ whatever these witnesses advanced from their
 “ own personal knowledge, but likewise every idle
 “ report they had picked up by hearsay was admit-
 “ ted, as genuine, and charged upon these young
 “ men ; who were even compelled to turn their
 “ own accusers, or else be condemned for contu-
 “ macious behaviour.” I shall consider these several
 articles of accusation, which, I confess, appear
 very formidable, and give an answer to each of
 them distinctly.

It is true the witnesses were examined without
 being put to their oath, nor was it thought ne-
 cessary that the evidence should be taken upon
 oath. The Vice-Chancellor acted not in this case
 in a judicial capacity, as if the proceedings had
 been in his court, but in a visitatorial one, (a dis-
 tinction which I am again obliged to remind you
 of) and therefore did not require strictly legal
 proof, but only the testimony of credible witnes-
 ses. This is the common method of proceeding
 in all enquiries made into the conduct of persons,
 who, for any crime laid to their charge, are cited
 or convened before their respective societies: where
 upon such proof, as the Head and Fellows deem
 sufficient, they inflict a punishment according to
 the nature of the offence, without the formality of
 a judicial process; and this even to expulsion: of
 which,

which, notwithstanding what you assert in page 17, with a malicious design to expose the University as the common sink of drunkenness, rioting, gaming, and every other enormity, I could give you many instances; and one in particular for irreligious and blasphemous tenets; to the infliction of which I myself was chiefly instrumental. Had the parties accused objected to the evidence thus taken, it might then have been proper that it should be given upon oath; but the truth is, they confessed every thing material that was alleged against them, and consequently there was no occasion for this confirmation of it. Mr. *Greaves* was indeed put to his oath at the desire of Mr. *Higson*, who apprehended he would not give his testimony, unless he became thus obliged to do it. Had the other party made the same request, it would undoubtedly have been granted; but conscious that it would have been of no service to them on their trial, they chose to reserve this circumstance, as matter of future complaint to the world, and a pretence for crying out persecution, star-chamber, &c. &c.

WHETHER the Vice-Chancellor admitted every idle report that had been picked up by hear-say; or whether these young men were obliged to turn their own accusers, or else be condemned for contumacious behaviour, will best appear from the minutes of the examination, which I began to take for my own private satisfaction, the registrar
being

being present to act in that capacity *ex officio*; who, observing that I was very punctual in noting every circumstance, requested me to continue my observations; in consequence of which I, as you call it, “officiated as secretary” — With what fidelity I officiated, the minutes themselves will evince; but I beg leave to inform you, that they were examined, article by article, by the Vice-Chancellor and all the assessors, before he proceeded to sentence; and were unanimously assented to, as faithfully recording every material circumstance of the examination. As they will be inserted in their proper place, I shall forbear to make any reflections on these, and the many other false and injurious insinuations, with which your pamphlet abounds, till I come to that part of the proceedings; when the world will be able to judge whether “^b both law and justice, as well as religion “and conscience, were put out of the question in “this transaction.”

By what method Mr. *Higson* ^s procured the evidence he produced, which is your next complaint, was by no means material to the Vice-Chancellor, who was only concerned to be informed of the truth. Yet, as if foreseeing what misrepresentations would be given of his conduct, he was cautious even in this point, and did not admit the evidence of the clergyman, whose character you load with so much infamy, till what was

^a P. 64.

^b P. 6.

^c Ibid.

advanced

advanced in his letter concerning Mr. *Jones* had been confirmed by Mr. *George*, a gentleman of *Christ Church*, who was present at the examination, bore testimony to the fair reputation of that clergyman, and declared that he had received from his own mouth every circumstance mentioned in the letter.

You likewise ^a complain that a copy of the articles was refused the unhappy sufferers after they were expelled; and in your ^b note upon this place you represent the Vice-Chancellor as acting a very inconsistent, not to say a base, part, disapproving in private what he had done in public; laying the odium of his conduct on the other Heads of Houses; “and by a soothing speech to the young “men in private hoping to shake off a little dirt “from himself”—or rather throwing a great deal both on himself and his assessors. That there was no injustice in refusing a copy of the articles is evident from the common practice of the courts of law on like occasions, of which we have a very recent instance in the case of Mr. *W*——s:—that a copy was refused, was the result of the Vice-Chancellor’s own opinion and determination, seconded by that of the other assessors: for my own part, I thought it quite a matter of indifference; but he foresaw what use would be made of it and therefore prudently reserved it, till your misrepresentations had made it necessary to be pub-

^a P. 7.

^b P. 8.

lished in his vindication. In ^a the conclusion indeed of your performance by way of softening matters, and soothing him, who equally despises your censure and your praise, you qualify these expressions, by saying that he only intimated as much; which in my opinion is reflecting still greater dishonour upon him; making him mean enough to be desirous that Mr. *Grove* and Mr. *Middleton* should think he meant to insinuate, what he dared not openly avow to them. The truth is, the Vice-Chancellor, as every man of humanity naturally would, expressed to those gentlemen his concern for being obliged to pass so severe a sentence on them, not thereby intimating that he thought they did not justly deserve the punishment, but, quite the contrary, lamenting that their misconduct had compelled him against his inclination to exercise so disagreeable an act of discipline. The murderer, when condemned by his judge, who generally tempers his sentence with expressions of pity and compassion, may with equal reason infer from those expressions, that he did not deserve so severe a punishment. The thanks given to Mr. *Higson* by the Vice-Chancellor were in the name, and with the approbation of all the assessors, who considered him as sacrificing his own interest to the welfare and reputation of the University, and therefore entitled to this mark of their approbation.

I MUST beg leave to add, by way of answer to the last part of your note, that the Vice-Chancellor did not inflict this punishment "for the
 "fake of obliging any persons whatever;" nor was there any danger that "the pious harmless
 "youths would be thereby reduced to the very
 "want of bread;" since most of them had been brought up to employments more suitable to their capacities, and station in life, whereby they might get an honest livelihood; but which they had deserted in order to intrude themselves into an office, for which they were utterly unqualified. It was kindness therefore, and not cruelty, to send them back to their own proper business; not that, were the consequences of their amotion even such as you represent them, they would be chargeable on the Vice-Chancellor, but on themselves; not on him, who was obliged *ex officio* to inflict the punishment; but on them, who had justly incurred it.

WE come now to the articles of accusation, which were exhibited to the Vice-Chancellor by Mr. *Higson* in the form of depositions, of which the following is an exact copy.

B

BEFORE

BEFORE the reverend and worshipful DAVID DURELL, Doctor of Divinity, Vice-Chancellor of the University of *Oxford*, Visitor of *St. Edmund-Hall* in the said University of *Oxford*, JOHN HIGSON, Master of Arts, Vice-Principal and Tutor of the said Hall, appointed and admitted as such, by THOMAS SHAW, Doctor in Divinity, Principal of the said Hall for the time being, in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and fifty one, and approved, and confirmed by the reverend and worshipful JOHN BROWN, Doctor in Divinity, Vice-Chancellor of the University of *Oxford* for the time being, as the statutes in that case made and provided direct, begs leave to propound and offer some articles of accusation against the following persons, scholars of the said Hall, BENJAMIN KAY, JAMES MATTHEWS, THOMAS JONES, THOMAS GROVE, ERASMUS MIDDLETON, BENJAMIN BLATCH, and JOSEPH SHIPMAN, and other matters relative thereto.

1st. That the aforesaid JAMES MATTHEWS, THOMAS JONES, and JOSEPH SHIPMAN were bred to trades, and that the three last mentioned persons, as also ERASMUS MIDDLETON and BENJAMIN BLATCH, were at the respective time of Entrance in the said Hall, and at present are, destitute of such a knowledge in the learned languages

guages as is necessary for performing the usual exercises of the said Hall and of the University.

2dly. That the aforesaid BENJAMIN KAY, JAMES MATTHEWS, THOMAS JONES, THOMAS GROVE, ERASMUS MIDDLETON, and JOSEPH SHIPMAN are enemies to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of *England*, which appeareth either by their preaching or expounding in, or frequenting, illicit conventicles, and by several other actions, and expressions, contrary to the statutes of the University and the laws of this realm.

3dly. That the aforesaid ERASMUS MIDDLETON is moreover an enemy to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of *England*, as appears by his officiating as a minister in holy orders; altho' a layman, in the parish Church of *Chevely*, or in one of the Chapels of Ease belonging and appertaining unto the said Church of *Chevely* in the county of *Berks*, and diocese of *Salisbury*.

4thly, The aforesaid JAMES MATTHEWS, ERASMUS MIDDLETON, and BENJAMIN BLATCH have behaved indecently towards the said *Higson*, Vice-Principal and Tutor, either by neglecting to attend his lectures, or misbehaving themselves, when at them; or by going out of the University without his the said *Higson's* leave, contrary to the discipline and good order of the said Hall.

5^{thly}, That the above premises are true, public, and notorious, and what the said parties named jointly and severally know in their consciences to be true.

6^{thly}, That by the statutes and usage of the University the said Hall is notoriously subject to the visitation of the Vice-Chancellor of *Oxford* for the time being.

7^{thly}, And lastly; That the said *Higson* from a regard to the honour and welfare of the University in general, and the said Hall in particular, and actuated by every principle religious and civil, makes this application to you the said Vice-Chancellor, as Visitor; and not confining himself to any superfluous proof, but only so far as he shall prove in the premises, that he may obtain in his prayer, he prays that these persons, against whom these articles are exhibited, may be treated and dealt with according to their demerits, and as the statutes of the Hall and the University require, as far as it shall seem good to your wisdom and justice, humbly imploring the aid of your worship's office.

Oxon. St. Edmund-Hall, February the twenty-ninth, 1768.

J. HIGSON.

Sworn before me on the
day and year above-
written.

D. DURELL, Vice-Chancellor.

THE Vice-Chancellor in consequence of these depositions, having previously consulted the Heads of Houses, and notified their opinion to the Principal, who expressed his approbation of it, caused a citation to be fixed on the chapel door of *Edmund-Hall*, requiring the parties accused to appear on a day and hour therein specified, to answer the several charges brought against them. Soon after the citation was put up, Mr. *Grove*, one of the persons accused, took his name out of the Hall-book, in order to escape the censure which, he had reason to apprehend, might be inflicted on him; but upon better advice he returned, and was re-admitted by the Principal, the Vice-Chancellor not being consulted on either of these points; however no notice was taken of this unwarrantable behaviour of Mr. *Grove* at the examination, tho' the Vice-Chancellor might with great propriety have animadverted upon it.

WHEN the day arrived, he and his assessors came to the Principal's lodgings, and from thence proceeded to the common Hall, intending to examine into the grounds of the complaint in a private manner; when they came there, they found a great number of gownsmen of all degrees assembled to hear the examination: however the Vice-Chancellor thought this unexpected audience would be no obstruction to the proceedings, and

consequently that there was no reason on that account for deferring them; but rather the reverse; as by this means the whole University would become acquainted with the nature of the accusation, the grounds of the proof, and, I will add, the impartiality of the Visitor. After the articles of accusation were read, Mr. *Higson* proceeded to his proofs in support of them; the substance of which I took down, with what exactness I could, in the following minutes. I shall make no apology for any inaccuracy which may appear either in the form or stile of these memorandums, which were taken without any connection, in the order in which they now stand, merely for my own private satisfaction, without the least thought of their being made public. Let me only observe that, while I was employed in taking these minutes, I did not suppose that the Vice-Chancellor and the other assessors were inattentive to what was going forward, or that the whole was to rest on what I had minuted down: but on the contrary had reason to believe that whatever circumstance might escape my notice would be supplied by the recollection of the other gentlemen; which was the real case.

MINUTES of the accusation brought against
JAMES MATTHEWS, THOMAS JONES, JOSEPH SHIPMAN, ERASMUS MIDDLETON, BENJAMIN KAY, THOMAS GROVE, and BENJAMIN BLATCH, of *Edmund-Hall*; their examination, &c.

JAMES MATTHEWS. Accused that he was brought up to the trade of a weaver — that he had kept a tap-house — confessed — Accused that he is totally ignorant of the Greek and Latin languages; which appeared by his declining all examination — said that he had been under the tuition of two clergymen for five years — viz. Mr. *Davies* and ^a *Newton*; though it did not appear

a Mr. *Newton* has informed me by letter that Mr. *Matthews* was never at his House but once, in the Year 1766, when he continued there not above one or two nights. — I was an entire stranger to Mr. *Newton*'s name till the day of examination, and therefore could not possibly have put it down in my minutes, had it not been mentioned by one of the parties; and that it was so mentioned is evident from the question asked by the author of *Pietas Oxoniensis*, who desires to know, “ why Mr. *Newton* was called Methodist ? ” However, to do him all the justice in my power, I here insert his own declaration, by which, I suppose, he means to disclaim all connections with that set of men, and expresses his concern for having been mentioned on this occasion. His words are these. “ As I think I can appeal to all who know me, that I have not at any time, either by my example or advice, encouraged irregular or hasty proceedings, but rather the contrary, I must own, I was both
“ concerned

that he had during that time made any proficiency in learning — was about thirty years old — accused of being a reputed methodist by the evidence of Mr. *Atkins* formerly of *Queen's-College* — that he was assistant to Mr. *Davies* a reputed methodist, that he was instructed by Mr. *Fletcher* a reputed methodist, — that he maintained the necessity of the sensible impulse of the holy Spirit — that he entered himself of *Edmund-Hall*, with a design to get into holy Orders, for which he had offered himself a candidate, tho' he still continues to be wholly illiterate, and incapable of doing the exercises of the Hall — proved — That he had frequented illicit conventicles held in a private house in *Oxford*. — confessed. He produced two testimonials, one vouched by the Bishop of *Litchfield* and *Coventry*, the other by the Bishop of *Worcester*.

THOMAS JONES. Accused that he had been brought up to the trade of a barber, which he had followed very lately — confessed — Had made a very small proficiency in the Greek and Latin languages — was two years standing, and still incapable of performing the statutable exercises of the Hall — that he had been at the meetings at Mrs. *Durbridge's* — that he had expounded the scriptures to a mixed congregation at *Wheaton-*

“ concerned and surprized that my Name should have been at
 “ all mentioned upon the occasion.”

Aston,

Aston, tho' not in holy Orders, and prayed extempore. All this he confessed. He urged in his defence that he had asked his Tutor whether he thought it wrong for him to pray or instruct in a private family, and that his Tutor answered, he did not, which he said, was the reason of his continuing to do it.

JOSEPH SHIPMAN. Accused that he had been brought up to the trade of a draper, and that he was totally illiterate; which appeared on his examination—accused that he had preached or expounded to a mixed assembly of people, tho' not in Orders, and prayed extempore—all which he confessed.

ERASMUS MIDDLETON — confesses to have done duty in a chapel of ease belonging to *Cheveley*, not being in holy Orders, three years before he entered of the University, but not since. That he was discarded by his father for being connected with the methodists.—That he had been refused Orders by the Bishop of *Hereford*, —said that he had written a letter to the Bishop acknowledging his Fault, and recanting his errors—That he was now in hopes of being reconciled to his father—That he had been maintained by his friends, but did not explain who those friends were — Accused that he was deficient in learning—that he was attached to Mr. *Haweis*, who had boasted that THEY should be able to get him into Orders.
That

That he holds that faith without works is the sole condition of salvation—that the immediate impulse of the spirit is to be waited for—that he denies all necessity of works—that he had taken frequent occasion to perplex and vex his Tutor—Part of this charge, especially concerning his tenets, he denied, tho' proved by the evidence of two gentlemen of the Hall.

BENJAMIN KAY. Confesses that he has been present at the meetings held in the house of Mrs. *Durbridge*, where he had heard extempore prayers frequently offered up by one *Hewett* a staymaker; that sometimes Mrs. *Durbridge* has read to them—Accused that he endeavoured to persuade a young man of *Magdalen-College*, who was sent into the country for having been tainted with calvinistical and methodistical principles, to leave his father—that he talked of their meeting with great opposition, meaning from the University—of this there was not sufficient evidence—that he holds, that the spirit of God works irresistibly—that once a child of God always a child of God—that he holds absolute election—that he had endeavoured to instil the same principles into others, and exhorted them to continue stedfastly in them against all opposition—Some of these tenets he seemed to deny, tho' it was fully proved by the evidence of Mr. *Welling*, commoner of the Hall.

THOMAS

THOMAS GROVE—Accused that he had preached to a mixed assembly of people called methodists, not being in Orders, which he confessed, and likewise that he prayed extempore—that he could not fall down upon his knees, and worship God in the form of the church of *England*, though he thought it a good form; proved by the evidence of Mr. *Bromhead*.

BENJAMIN BLATCH. A gentleman, who has not had any school-learning, is not certain whether he shall pursue any profession — and therefore dismissed.

THIS, Sir, is the substance of what appeared to me material during the course of the examination, put down indeed in a hasty manner, as the time would permit, but with fidelity and without aggravation: and, tho' I had omitted some circumstances which occurred to the other assessors, yet I am conscious of having placed nothing to the account of the parties accused, but what was urged and proved against them, though the proof itself be not always mentioned; taking notice at the same time of whatever was urged by any of them, either in their defence, or extenuation of their crime. How little I have deserved the severe censure contained in your note p. 64. will appear from my minutes of Mr. *Middle-*

^a *Middleton's* examination; from which the world will be able to judge whether you, or I, have been guilty of putting down a false accusation, as true; and whether the ^b Spirit of truth, love, and candor influenced your heart, and guided your pen, when you wrote that malicious slander.

WHEN we met at the Vice-Chancellor's lodgings to review all that had passed at the examination, every circumstance recorded in the above minutes was thoroughly canvassed: some particulars not mentioned in them recollected; and the whole of the accusation, proof, and defence, duly weighed, and maturely considered: when we came to an unanimous determination; which, together with the reasons whereon it was founded, is fully expressed in the sentence pronounced by the Vice-Chancellor, of which the following is an exact copy.

a From the account Mr. *Middleton* gave of himself, the Vice-Chancellor and his Assessors imagined he had received a school-education, and was bred up with an intention to be sent to the University; but I have since received the following account of him, which I give you upon very good authority. “*Erasmus Middleton* was born at *Horncastle*, a market town in *Lincolnshire*, where he served an apprenticeship to his father, who is a carpenter, and with whom he worked as a journeyman, until discarded for neglect of business, the consequence of his conversion to methodism.” — Had I pryed into Mr. *Middleton's* private concerns, as you represent me to have done, I should certainly have discovered this, and probably many other circumstances not to his advantage.

b P. 2.

Oxford

Oxford, March 11th, 1768.

- I. It having appeared to me D. DURELL, Vice-Chancellor of the University of *Oxford*, and undoubted Visitor of *St. Edmund-Hall*, within the said University, upon due information and examination, that *James Matthews* of the said Hall, had been originally brought up to the trade of a weaver, and afterwards followed the low occupation of keeping a tap-house; that, afterwards, having connected himself with known methodists, he did, without any the least proficiency in school knowledge, enter of *St. Edmund-Hall* aforesaid, with a design to get into holy Orders; and that he still continues to be wholly illiterate, incapable of doing the statutable exercises of the Hall, and consequently more incapable of being qualified for holy Orders, for which he had lately offered himself a candidate. Moreover it having appeared by his own confession, that he had frequented illicit conventicles held in a private house in the city of *Oxford*. — Therefore I, D. DURELL, by virtue of my visitatorial power, and with the advice and opinion of the Reverend THOMAS RANDOLPH, D. D. President of *C. C. C.* and *Margaret* Professor of Divinity in this University, of the Reverend THOMAS FOTHERGILL, D. D. Provost of *Queen's-College*, of the Reverend THOMAS NOWELL, D. D. Principal of *St. Mary-Hall*, and Public Orator, and of the Reverend FRANCIS ATTERBURY, M. A.
- Senior

Senior Proctor of this University, my several assessors regularly appointed on this occasion, do expel the said *James Matthews* from the said Hall, and do hereby pronounce him expelled.

II. IT having also appeared to me that *Thomas Jones* of *St. Edmund-Hall* had been brought up to the trade of a barber, which occupation he had followed very lately ; that he had made but a small proficiency in learning, and was incapable of performing the statutable exercises of the said Hall : and moreover, it having appeared by his own confession, that he had frequented illicit conventicles in a private house in this town, and that he had himself held an assembly for public worship at *Wheat-Aston* ; in which he himself, though not in holy Orders, had publicly expounded the Scriptures to a mixed congregation, and offered up extempore prayers. —Therefore I, D. DURELL, by virtue of my visitatorial power, and with the advice and opinion of each and every of my assessors, the reverend persons afore-named, do expel the said *Thomas Jones*, from the said Hall ; and hereby pronounce him also expelled.

III. IT having also appeared to me that *Joseph Shipman* of *St. Edmund-Hall* afore-said had been a draper ; was very illiterate, and incapable of performing the statutable exercises of the said Hall. Moreover, it having appeared by his own confession,

cession, that he had expounded publicly, though not in holy Orders, the holy Scriptures to a mixed congregation, and offered up extempore prayers.

—Therefore I, D. DURELL, by virtue of my visitatorial power, and with the advice and opinion of each and every one of my assessors, the reverend persons afore-named, do expel the said *Joseph Shipman* from the said Hall; and hereby pronounce him also expelled.

IV. It having also appeared to me, that *Erasmus Middleton* of St. *Edmund-Hall* aforesaid, by his own confession, had formerly officiated in the chapel of ease belonging to the parish of *Chevely* in the county of *Berks*, not being in holy Orders; that he had been rejected from holy Orders by the Bishop of *Hereford* for the said offence; that he was discarded by his father for being connected with the people called *Metbodists*; and that he still lies under his father's displeasure for the same. Moreover, it having appeared by credible witnesses, that he is still connected with the said people, and professes their doctrines. viz. that Faith without works is the sole condition of salvation; that there is no necessity of works—that the immediate impulse of the Spirit is to be waited for. — Therefore I, D. DURELL, by virtue of my visitatorial power, and with the advice and opinion of each and every one of my assessors, the reverend persons afore-mentioned, do expel the said *Erasmus Middleton*

dleton from the said Hall, and hereby pronounce him also expelled.

V. It having also appeared to me that *Benjamin Kay* of the said Hall, by his own confession, had frequented illicit conventicles in a private house in this town; where he had heard extempore prayers frequently offered up by one *Hewett*, a staymaker. Moreover, it having been proved by sufficient evidence that he held methodistical principles; viz. the doctrine of absolute election; that the Spirit of God works irresistibly; that once a child of God always a child of God: that he had endeavoured to instil the same principles into others, and exhorted them to continue stedfastly in them against all opposition.—Therefore I, D. DURELL, by virtue of my visitatorial power, and with the advice and opinion of each and every one of my assessors, the reverend persons before-mentioned, do expel the said *Benjamin Kay* from the said Hall, and hereby pronounce him also expelled.

VI. It having also appeared to me that *Thomas Grove*, of St. *Edmund-Hall* aforesaid, tho' not in holy Orders, had, by his own confession, lately preached to an assembly of people called *Methodists* in a barn, and had offered up extempore prayers in that congregation.—Therefore I, D. DURELL, by virtue of my visitatorial power, and with the advice and opinion of
of

of each and every one of my assessors, the reverend persons before-named, do expel the said *Thomas Grove* from the said Hall, and hereby pronounce him also expelled.

SUCH, Sir, was the sentence, which you represent to be the most cruel and unjust that ever was passed; and such the reasons on which it was founded. I shall not stay to make any general observations on it; but hasten to answer the particular objections you have urged against it, article by article.

BUT before I proceed, I cannot help observing that under a pretence of a greater method and perspicuity you have inverted the order of the charge, even as it stands in your own articles of accusation. The order in which it stood on the examination, and which is most natural, was this—Ist, the accusation of some of them being brought up to trade; which would have had no weight, had it not been connected with the second—viz. that they were totally illiterate, and incapable of performing the statutable exercises of the University, and their Hall—then followed the third—viz. that they had frequented illicit conventicles, in which they had preached, and prayed extempore; and that one of them had officiated as a minister in holy Orders,

a P. 11.

C

though

though a layman ;—the 4th was, that they held and maintained tenets contrary to the doctrine of the church of *England* ; however that I may not be obliged to turn over your book backwards and forwards to reduce it to regularity and method, I shall take it as it stands, and attend you page by page, as nearly as I can, through the whole labyrinth of your work.

^a THE first charge you consider is that of attending illicit conventicles. To ascertain what is a conventicle you quote *Jacob's* law dictionary, but with great partiality, and want of fidelity ; you adopt only what may best serve your turn, leaving out what makes against you, though immediately connected with what you quote : thus you drop the definition of a conventicle, which is “ a private assembly for “ the exercise of religion,” but take the words immediately following it ; and here you stop ; paying no regard to Mr. *Jacob's* quotation from 22 *Car. II.* which declares what conventicles are illegal. Nor are you more faithful in quoting that act of parliament ; you give us the preamble, but conceal the part, which alone relates to the point in question, where it is enacted that, if any person above the age of sixteen shall be present at any assembly, conventicle, or meeting, under colour or pretence of any exercise of religion in other manner than according to the liturgy and practice of the church of *England*, at which conventicle there shall be

five persons or more assembled together over and besides those of the same household, if it be a house where there is a family inhabiting; or if it be in a house, or field, or place where there is no family inhabiting, then, when any five persons or more are so assembled, every one shall be subject to the penalty of five shillings for the first offence, and ten shillings for the second.

SECT. 3. Every person, who shall take upon him to preach or teach in any such meeting, assembly, or conventicle, shall forfeit twenty pounds for the first offence, and forty pounds for the second.

SECT. 4. If any person shall suffer any such conventicle, assembly, or unlawful meeting, as aforesaid, to be held in his house, out-house, barn, yard, or back-side, he shall forfeit twenty pounds.

THIS act, as the author of the remarks upon Mr. *Whitefield's* letter observes, is indeed in some degree altered by the toleration-act; by which some conventicles are permitted under certain restrictions; but all other conventicles, which come not under the description given of such as are thereby permitted, are still continued to be forbidden by the 22 *Car.* II.

THUS sect. 19. No congregation, or assembly for religious worship shall be permitted or allowed by this act, until such place of meeting shall be certified to the Bishop of the diocese, or Arch-deacon

of the arch-deaconry, or to the Justices of the peace at their general quarter-sessions for the county, city, or place, in which such meetings shall be held and registered in the said Bishop's or Arch-deacon's court, or recorded at the said general quarter-sessions of the peace. Hence all conventicles, assemblies, or meetings, as described in 22 *Car.* II. cap. 1. and not registered or recorded according to the toleration-act, are illicit and prohibited. The meetings therefore which these gentlemen attended were certainly conventicles, being "private assemblies for the exercise of religion;" and they were illicit conventicles, "there being more than five persons assembled there, besides those of the same household." Nor does the law require proof of any dangerous practices carried on at such meetings; it provides a speedy remedy against the dangers, which may possibly, and will probably, arise from such meetings; and forbids them, because sectaries have, or may, at such meetings, contrive insurrections.

Not being acquainted with the ^a *Kentish* story, to which you appeal as decisive in this point, I cannot contradict you with regard to the fact itself, but have great reason to suppose it did not turn on that hinge, on which you rest it. The conventicle might be illicit, and yet the Justice of peace become liable to punishment for having taken unwarrantable and illegal measures to suppress it; he might therefore be glad to compound matters, and make them up

^a P. 14.

in the manner you relate; a case which, I apprehend, frequently happens. And as to the ^a religious societies in Queen *Anne's* time; if they were composed of Lords spiritual and temporal, &c. I will take upon me to pronounce that they did not permit laymen, barbers, weavers, staymakers, &c. to pray extempore, or to preach, and expound the scriptures to them — But that members of the church of *England* may be, and actually have been, censured for frequenting illicit conventicles is very evident from Queen *Elizabeth's* circular letter to the Bishops throughout *England*; in which your meetings are exactly described, and the pernicious tendency of them fully set forth — The following is a copy of it, taken from *Strype's* life of Archbishop *Grindal* — Appendix, P. 85.

THE Queen to the Bishops throughout
England for the suppressing the exercise
called PROPHESYING, &c.

RIGHT Reverend Father in GOD, we greet you well. We hear to our great grief, that in sundry parts of our realm there are no small number of persons presuming to be teachers and preachers of the church (though neither lawfully thereunto called, nor yet fit for the same) which, contrary to our laws established for the public divine service of Almighty God, and the administration of his holy

sacraments within this church of *England*, do daily devise, imagine, propound and put in execution fundry new rites and forms in the church, as well by their unordinate preaching, reading, and ministring the sacraments, as by procuring unlawfully of assemblies, and great number of our people out of their ordinary parishes, and from places far distant (and that also some of our subjects of good calling, tho' therein not well advised) to be hearers of their disputations, and new devised opinions upon points of divinity, far unmeet for vulgar people: which manner of innovation, they in some places term PROPHESYINGS, and in some other places EXERCISES. By which manner of assemblies great numbers of our people, especially the vulgar sort (meet to be otherwise occupied with honest labour for their living) are brought to idleness, and seduced; and in manner schismatically divided among themselves into variety of dangerous opinions, not only in towns and parishes, but even in some families, and manifestly thereby encouraged to the violation of our laws, and to the breach of common order, and finally to the offence of all our quiet subjects, that desire to live, and serve God, according to the uniform orders established in the church: whereof the sequel cannot but be dangerous to be suffered.

WHEREFORE considering it should be the duty of the Bishops, being the principal ordinary officers in the church of God, as you are one, to see these disorders

disorders against the honour of God, and quietness of the church, reformed; and that we see that by the encrease of these, through sufferance, great danger may ensue, even to the decay of christian faith, whereof we are by God appointed the defender; beside the other great inconveniences, to the disturbance of our peaceable government: we therefore according to the authority we have, do charge and command you, as the bishop of that diocese, with all manner of diligence, to take order through your diocese, as well in places exempt as otherwise, that no manner of public and divine service, nor other form of administration of the holy sacraments, nor any other rites and ceremonies, be in any sort used in the church, but directly according to the orders established by our laws: neither that any manner of person be suffered within your diocese to preach, teach, read, or exercise any function in the church, but such as shall be lawfully approved and licensed, as persons able for their knowledge, and conformable to the ministry in the rites and ceremonies of this church of *England*. And where there shall not be sufficient able persons for learning in any cures to preach and instruct your cures as were requisite, there shall you limit the curates to read the public homilies, according to the injunctions heretofore by us given for like cases.

AND furthermore, considering for the great abuses that have been in sundry places of our realm,
by

by reason of the aforesaid assemblies called EXERCISES; and for that the same are not, nor have not, been appointed nor warranted by us, or by our laws, we will, and straitly charge you, that you do cause the same forthwith to cease, and not to be used: but if any shall attempt, or continue, or renew the same, we will you not only to commit them unto prison, as maintainers of disorders, but also to advise us, or our council, of the names and qualities of them, and of their maintainers and abettors: that thereupon, for better example, their punishment may be made more sharp for their reformation.

AND in these things we charge you to be careful and vigilant, as by your negligence, if we should hear of any person attempting to offend in the premises without your correction, or information to us, we be not forced to make some example in reforming of you according to your deserts.

Given under our signet at our manor of *Greenwich*, the 7th day of *May* 1577, in the xixth year of our reign^a.

^a I quoted the above letter merely to prove that members of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND have been censured for frequenting illicit conventicles, and therefore had no occasion to take notice of Archbishop *Grindal's* answer; in which however, he assures her Majesty, that "No man may speak in those exercises unless he be first allowed by the Bishop, with this proviso, that
" no

You next appeal to the canons of the church ; or rather having put your own construction on one of them, you infer in general that “ from their “ a authority likewise it is most clear that there is “ no prohibition laid on any members of the church “ of *England* FOR meeting together for religious “ purposes, (I quote your own words though they “ are not very grammatical) provided such meeting tend not to the impeaching or depraving the “ doctrine of the church of *England*, the book of “ common prayer, the public peace, nor any part “ of the government and discipline established in “ the church.” Supposing this to be the case, I believe the meetings which these men frequented, and in which some of them officiated, will justly come under the above description, and manifestly

“ no LAYMAN, be suffered to speak at any time.” And yet those meetings, so circumstanced, were prohibited, as being a violation of our laws and a breach of common order. What then would the Queen have thought, or what must we think, of YOUR meetings, in which the most ignorant mechanics are both speakers and teachers ? Your description of Queen *Elizabeth*’s religious character, representing her to be little better than a roman catholic, and making her “ zeal for the reformation “ only subservient to the temporal interests of the state, in order “ to establish her own supremacy instead of the Pope’s,” does great honour, to be sure, to the memory of that Princess, who suffered imprisonment, and was in truth almost a martyr for the reformation.

a P. 13.

tended

tended to the impeaching and depraving the doctrine of the church of *England*, the book of common prayer, and the government and discipline of the church.

BUT is this the only canon of the church which relates to the point in question? does not the 71st canon forbid even ministers to preach, or administer the holy communion, in any private house, except it be in times of necessity; upon pain of suspension for the first offence, and excommunication for the second? Laymen therefore are *a fortiori* prohibited from presuming to do either. Nor^a are all MINISTERS permitted even to expound any scripture or matter of doctrine, in their own cure, or elsewhere; but such only as have been examined and approved by the Bishop of the diocese, or licensed. Will you now say that these meetings in private houses, in which not only ministers, but illiterate laymen take upon them to preach, and expound the scriptures, are not prohibited by, or that the persons guilty of such presumption do not offend against, the canons of the church? And if they offend against the canons of the church, they certainly incur the penalty of the statutes of the University; which forbid all persons to frequent illicit conventicles under pain of expulsion; and call all such conventicles illicit, in which men meet either publicly or privately in a way not allowed by the

a 49 can.

statutes of the realm, or the canons of the church, or the rules of the University; they are prohibited by the two former, and consequently must be a violation of the latter. Besides, these young men, had they been capable of construing the University statutes, which they had sworn to observe, must have known that all scholars are forbidden to frequent the houses of townsmen, and consequently that meetings held at such houses are not allowed by the rules of the University. And surely in this place there can be no occasion or pretence for such religious meetings: there are prayers here in every chapel twice a day; there are sermons at the University church twice every Sunday, and once every holiday; besides other occasional sermons. If this were not sufficient, those pious gentlemen might have joined together in prayer within their own halls, or colleges. But to hold such meetings in private houses in the town was directly contrary to the discipline and rules of the University, to the canons of the church, and the statutes of the realm; I may add, to the articles likewise; which, at their admission into the University, they subscribed to. The 23d article expressly declares, that it is not lawful for any man to take upon himself the office of preaching, before he is lawfully called.—“^a But
 “ was it the design of the legislature to prohibit all
 “ members of the church from joining together in
 “ prayer for the welfare of the church, unless it

^a P. 14.

“ were

“ were within the consecrated walls ? ” — was this all that was done ? was there not expounding ? were there not extempore prayers offered up ? and that by persons unauthorized to do either. “ ^b But “ if upon any occasion there happened to be half “ a dozen guests or strangers present at the stated “ family-worship in a house ” — was then the presence of these guests only accidental, or once upon an occasion ? I am well acquainted with the nature of these meetings in general, and the numbers which, deserting their own parish church, flock together from all parts of the neighbourhood to attend them ; I have frequently been an eye witness of the vain self-sufficiency of these gifted teachers, and of the ignorant zeal, and stupid admiration of their hearers : I cannot therefore be imposed upon by your representation of them. Yet supposing there were only five thus present, it is contrary to the express words of the act of Parliament cited by you ; and which, one would have thought, must have stared you in the face, as they follow immediately after those you have quoted. Strange it is indeed that undergraduates in the University, greatly deficient in learning and abilities, without regular orders, or mission, should think themselves qualified, or authorized, to expound the scriptures in a mixt congregation, and to offer up extempore prayers for, and in the name of, such congregation : and still more strange it is that a silly wo-

man, or illiterate staymaker, should presume to do this; and that these gentlemen should, by their attendance at those meetings, uphold and encourage such presumption. Nay, one of them was convicted of officiating, tho' not in orders, as a curate in a country parish church: this indeed you allow to have been a " ^a very high indiscretion; tho' you " must believe that his motive was good;" that is, you are resolved to believe nothing bad of him, tho' ever so true, and every thing good, however false. But why must his motive be good? " ^b because, say you, he could have no temporal interest in what he did" — that is more than I know, or you can be certain of—But might not his motive be pride, arrogance, self-conceit, presumption? and call you these motives good? you urge likewise that this " ^c was before he was a member " of the University, and that he had behaved ever " since with the greatest regularity," Had this daring impiety been known before his admission, the Vice-Chancellor would not have permitted him to become a member of the University; as soon as it was known, it was a sufficient reason to remove him. An indiscretion is surely a very mild term for a high offence against the laws both of God and his country, the sin of *Korah*, *Dathan*, and *Abiram*. Nor did it appear that he had behaved ever since with the greatest regularity, but just the contrary.

a P. 23.

b Ibid.

c P. 24.

THREE others were also convicted of preaching, or expounding, as they call it, in congregations in the country. I wonder how they could think themselves called or qualified so to do, unless they had the gift of immediate and extraordinary inspiration; and this you seem to think they had, as you compare their case with that of Christ and his Apostles. But if this were really the case, what business had they here? They had no occasion to come to the University for instruction or degrees, or to apply for orders. They were mispending their time, not standing in need of any qualification, they could be supposed to acquire here — But this point will be more fully considered in its proper place. The other two confessed that they had frequented these meetings—All of them had therefore incurred the penalty of expulsion under this first charge.

YOU say in their defence, “^a that they did
 “ abstain from these meetings, as soon as ever
 “ they were told that they were contrary to the will
 “ of those, who had the authority over them in the
 “ University, and that not one of them had been
 “ present at any such meetings for some months be-
 “ fore their expulsion: but all declared it was
 “ their determination not to attend them again”—
 But how does this declaration agree with their pre-

sent behaviour? was it not a mere jesuitical one, made only to serve their turn at that time? but not answering their purpose then, they have ever since totally disregarded it, and acted in open violation of it. For (I assert it on very good authority) they are now, and have been for some time, preaching, and expounding, and holding these meetings up and down the country, to the reproach of their conduct, but to the full justification of the Vice-Chancellor's sentence — A sentence which you call most cruel and ignominious; and tell us that “^a only one example can be produced within “ these hundred years of so public an infliction of a “ like punishment” — I have already refuted this assertion; and could give you many instances of the like punishment, did I think it consistent with charity to rip up private characters, and again expose those who have already suffered for, and, I hope, long ago repented of their crimes. But I must take the liberty to tell you that you have greatly misrepresented the fact you allude to. If you mean Mr. — of *H—f—d C* — it is notorious that he was expelled the University by a public act of convocation — If you allude to an affair which happened forty years ago at *A—d—n*, wherein some persons of *M—d—n C* — were concerned; the persons guilty of that act of impiety, tho’ not such as you represent it, were likewise expelled, and the sentence of their expulsion now stands recorded

on the college register, expressed in terms of the greatest abhorrence.—But you relate nothing upon hearsay —

THE next charge against these persons, in the order in which you place it, was, that three of them were bred to trades. You allow the charge; but ^aplead that *St. Paul* was a tent-maker; that *David* was called from the sheepfold; that *Amos* was an herdsman, our Lord himself a carpenter, and his Apostles fishermen — What trifling is this? when you will shew that these men have the same divine mission, which the prophets and apostles had, and bring the same proof of it from the gift of miracles and prophecy, then we will allow them to do, as the prophets and apostles did. But ^b several worthy prelates were bred to trades: it may be so. Some persons have been sent to school, and their parents not being able to maintain them at the University, have been afterwards put out to trades: but having imbibed a relish for learning, and having in consequence a dislike for the business of trade, they have met with friends, who have supported them here. Others have been originally bred to trades, but discovering a genius for learning, they have been sent to school, and, after a proper education there, have entered themselves in the University; and some of these persons have become afterwards eminent in the learned professions.

a P. 18.

b P. 19.

But

But as you have had the confidence to shelter the illiberal education and low ignorance of these men under the sanction of a very learned, and very venerable character, I beg leave to contradict your account of that eminent prelate's education upon the best authority, which is, his own. That dignitary, by whose death the church of *England* is deprived of her greatest ornament, and best support, being justly offended at the liberty you have taken with him, drew up with his own hand the following account of the manner in which he was educated, before he became a member of the University: which he desired might be here inserted in answer to your misrepresentation of it.—His words are these, “Whereas it is asserted in a pamphlet entitled *Pietas Oxoniensis*, p. 19. that a very great dignitary in the church was educated in the profession of a man midwife among the dissenters: the real fact is this, that the person supposed to be meant was educated first in a public grammar-school, then for five or six years in dissenting Academies, then for two years pursued his studies privately; then in the year 1716, and not before, he applied himself to the study of physic, which he continued till near the middle of 1720, and not longer; that, during this time, among many other courses of lectures, he attended (at *Paris* only) one in midwifery; but that he never professed, nor practised, nor intended to practise that, or any other branch of surgery, nor ever acted as a physician, otherwise than occasionally among the

D

“poorest

“poorest of his Parishioners.” This is the account that great prelate gives of himself. I think it necessary to add, that he was admitted a gentleman commoner of *Exeter* college in *April* 1721, being then ^a twenty years old; and had the degree of Bachelor of Arts conferred on him in the act term following, in consequence of the studies he had pursued, and the progress he had made in literary accomplishments. The letter, by which the Chancellor expressed his assent to that favour, contains a very remarkable circumstance, which ought not to be omitted, and upon which the petition was founded. It is this, “that, contrary to his own inclinations, he was sent by his guardian to the University of *Leyden*, where he proceeded regularly to the degree of Doctor of Physic, as appeared by the printed exercise which he performed on that occasion.” His character from this time became too well known in the learned world to need any farther account of it here.

NOR are you more happy in the other instances, by which you would countenance the ignorance of these men. The great cardinal *Wolsey*, of whatever quality or occupation his father might have

^a So it stands in the matriculation book, on the authority of which I inserted it; “Tho: Secker 20. Tho: fil. de Sibthorp in Com: Nottingham: gen: fil.” — But upon calculation it appears to have been a mistake, and should, instead of 20, be 28. Your insinuation that I made the mistake on purpose to mislead the reader is very unjust, for, to prevent his being misled, I inserted it among the errata as soon as I discovered it.

been,

been, (though it appears by his will that he was a man of no mean circumstances) was bred up from his infancy to learning, in which he made so rapid a progress, that he took the degree of Bachelor of Arts in this University when he was only 14 years of age; and was at that time distinguished for his abilities in every branch of literature. Supposing then that his father was a butcher, will that justify your assertion that the son was bred up in a butcher's shop? unless you mean that every son must be of the same occupation as his father.

BISHOP *Maddox* likewise was from a child bred up at a regular grammar school: but having the misfortune to lose his father, he fell into the hands of friends who were dissenters; and were therefore unwilling that he should be ordained according to the rites of the Church of *England*; while he on the other hand was old enough to declare against taking Orders in their Church: They therefore put him to a pastry-cook upon trial, but before he was bound apprentice, the master came to his relations, and told them that the boy was not fit for his trade, and was sure he would never make any thing of it, that he was continually reading books of learning above his (the master's) comprehension, and therefore advised that they should take him away, and send him back to school to follow the bent of his inclination. This was accordingly done, and from school he went to *Edenburgh*, and on his return was entered of *Queen's*

College. I need not inform you what figure he made in life.

You may depend upon the truth of the above relation; which is given by a very eminent Person, who received it from the bishop's own mouth.

THE late Proctor was educated on the foundation at *Westminster*, and from thence elected a Student of *Christ Church*: after several year's residence in the University he served his country for some short time, not in the army, but in a county militia.—To what purpose then have you introduced any of these instances? how different is the case of every one of them from that of the persons removed from hence by the Vice-Chancellor? when they left their trades, they did not go to any regular school, but were sent to the house of some private clergyman, where they might possibly imbibe the principles of methodism, and a contempt for human knowledge, but appeared to have made no proficiency in the languages, or any part of learning. Nay, one of them, tho' totally illiterate, was assistant to one of those clergymen; from whence we may fairly conclude what sort of learning was cultivated under his tuition. Their being bred to trades therefore was not charged upon them as a crime, nor would it have been made any objection at all, if they had appeared to have made a proper proficiency in learning, but the

the contrary appeared most plainly. Which is the third charge you consider.

You affect to laugh at this charge as full of absurdity — “^a if they were backward in their studies, was not this the best reason in the world why they should be suffered to pursue them? Would ^b you drive a man from the seat of learning and knowledge, because he is yet deficient in the knowledge of the languages?” If this be just reasoning, then the most ignorant persons are the most proper to become members of the University; then ought our Colleges and Halls to be filled with mechanics and plowmen. Surely some qualifications of school learning are necessary in those who have any reason to expect improvement here. The sphere of the University, especially in its present state, is rather the sciences than the first elements of learning. Can it be expected that persons whose early years have been engaged in the pursuit of such employments, as suppose a total inattention to study, should, when they arrive to the state of manhood (which was the case of these men) be qualified for a learned profession, or capable of receiving academical knowledge? Such knowledge, to borrow the ingenious metaphor which you have adopted from a news paper, was too strong meat for such weak stomachs. If a person can neither construe the statutes, which are his rule of action, nor perform the exercises re-

^a P. 19.

^b P. 20.

quired both in the University, and in every College and Hall, he is not likely to improve much here: Such an ignorant person is not fit to be admitted here, nor is it any injury to remove him from hence. And it is more especially necessary so to do, if it shall appear that he entertains hopes by this means to thrust himself into the ministry.

BUT “^a can their tutor,” say you, “deny that “they had made considerable progress in their learning, since they entered at the Hall?” Yes, he can, and did deny it: that was part of his charge against them, and their examination shewed that they had made no such progress. But you seem to think their ^b “literary abilities were not put to a proper “trial.” Their examination was very easy; they were only required to construe the *Greek* testament, and the statutes of the University; and could do neither. They were allowed all the time to recollect themselves, and to consider the passages proposed to them, that they could desire. If they “^c were under much confusion and discomposure in “such a public place,” why did they not desire a more private examination? This the Vice-Chancellor and his Assessors would have readily consented to, but none of them made any such application. But they did not appear to be under the least confusion or discomposure — they had been used to speak before much larger assemblies, and it was observed that they did not want confidence

^a P. 20.

^b Ibid.

^c Ibid.

on this occasion. ^a “ But there were very many
 “ persons of the Hall, equally, if not more defi-
 “ cient.” I hope not. There was only one person
 more accused; who confessing his ignorance, de-
 clined all examination; but as he was represented
 to be a man of fortune, and declared that he was
 not designed for holy orders, the Vice-Chancellor
 did not think fit to remove him for this reason
 only, though he was supposed to be one of the
^b righteous over-much, as you express it. If there
 were any others equally illiterate, they ought to
 have been particularly accused, and application
 made to the Visitor for their removal: I am satis-
 fied he would have been ready to hear and redress
 such complaint. He was at that time examining
 into the articles of accusation brought against par-
 ticular members of that society by Mr. *Higson*, he
 could not therefore with propriety proceed to any
 other matter of grievance not alleged in those
 articles; but the Principal, who desired that others
 might be examined, was requested, if he had mat-
 ter of complaint against any of his members, to ex-
 hibit it, and the Vice-Chancellor would appoint a
 day for hearing it: but ^c he declined the proposal.

^a P. 20.

^b P. 21.

^c Notwithstanding what is here urged, you still persist in
 your abuse of the Vice-Chancellor for not having proceeded
 against others, who you tell us, were equally, if not more, illi-
 terate than the expelled members, and had no religion. If this
 account be true, such a Society, made up of ignorance, enthu-
 siasm, and infidelity, I must say, was a disgrace to the Uni-
 versity;

Besides, I apprehend, he might himself remove any members from his society, whom he conceived to be a disgrace to it; and if the ^a Tutor had introduced any such illiterate pupils into the Hall, in which case I should think him very culpable (tho' he could not have done this without the consent of the Principal) it was in the Principal's option whether they should continue there, and be permitted "just to keep their terms, and get into orders," to the disgrace of the Church and the University.

BUT the truth is, you, if you are consistent with your own principles, think no one disqualified to become or continue a member of the University on account of ^b age, ignorance, or former occupation; you exclaim loudly against such removals. The proceedings in this case have been called tyranny and persecution; the Vice-Chancellor and his assessors have been compared to *Bonner* and the popish persecutors. You call it "the most severe punish-

ment; and the Principal ought in duty to have removed all such from his Hall. But had the Vice-Chancellor made a general visitation of the Hall, when articles of accusation had been exhibited only against some of its members, you would have been the first to accuse him of officiousness and tyranny, and the Principal, who would himself have been included in such a visitation, might have had reason to complain. But whatever were the Principal's motives for not proceeding, when thus publicly called upon, against those illiterate, and irreligious members of his society, his refusal cannot without great injustice, be charged to the Vice-Chancellor as the effect of partiality in him.

^a P. 21.

^b *ibid.*

“ment an University can inflict; a cruel ignomi-
 “ous sentence; turning them out to starve; a
 “punishment which may reduce them to the very
 “want of bread, and cast a lasting stigma upon their
 “names and characters.” Happy these gentlemen,
 to find so eloquent and zealous an advocate! But
 where after all was the great injury done them?
 they were deprived of neither liberty, property, nor
 life; they were of no foundation, nor had any free-
 hold in the University, but were mispending both
 their money and their time. Nor had they any
 character to lose; if henceforth they are known to
 be illiterate, that could only be a reproach to
 them while they assumed the character of gowns-
 men; but can be none, while they act in their
 own proper one of weaver, barber, or tapster.
 The Vice-Chancellor had as much right and reason
 to remove them from the University, as a school-
 master has to remove scholars from his school, who
 are incapable of making any proficiency there.
 They were not qualified to improve in academical
 studies, nor capable of performing the exercises of
 the University and the Hall. It was therefore no
 injury (I repeat it again) but rather a kindness to
 send them from a place, where they were mis-em-
 ploying their time, and abusing the ill-placed
 kindness of their friends, who supported them here
 in idleness, that they might follow their respective
 trades elsewhere, and get their livelihood in an
 honest, and reputable manner. Mr. J—s makes
 a good perriwig; he need not starve, he may get
 his

his bread by his proper profession. Mr. *M—s* and Mr. *S—n* may maintain themselves and serve their country better at the loom, or at the tap, or behind the counter, than they were likely to do in the pulpit — *tractent fabrilia fabri*. — The last gentleman, we were assured from his mistress, bore a very good character, and behaved with diligence and fidelity in her service, till he was seduced by the Methodists; when idleness succeeded to diligence, and negligence took the place of fidelity; let him return to her service, and by a faithful discharge of his duty recover his lost reputation.

If these gentlemen have by our sentence been debarred from entering into the ministry, this is also no injury, but rather a kindness to them, as well as a service done to the public. They are prevented from exposing themselves, and misleading others. I beg leave to recommend to their serious perusal the excellent sermon of Bishop *Bull*, concerning the great difficulty and danger of the priestly office. “ How horrible (says that worthy prelate) “ is the confidence, or rather impudence of those “ mechanics, that have leapt from the shop-board, or “ the plough, into the pulpit, and thus, per saltum, “ by a prodigious leap commenced teachers! what “ shall we say to these mountebanks in the Church, “ these empirics in theology? I can only say this, “ I can never sufficiently admire either their bold- “ ness in adventuring to be teachers, or the child- “ ish folly and simplicity of those that give them-
“ selves

“ selves up to be their disciples. ’Tis a miracle
 “ that any such person should dare to preach, or,
 “ if he do, that any man in his right wits should
 “ vouchsafe to hear him.” — If Mr. *Higson* has in-
 troduced ^a others of the same stamp, the above re-
 flection will be equally worthy of their attention.

AND here, sir, it will be proper to introduce Mr. *Welling*, who, you tell us, had asserted, as appeared upon the trial, that “ whosoever believeth the miracles of our Saviour, or of *Moses* must be a knave or a fool ; and is well known in the Hall by the name of the Infidel ^b.” If this were his known character, why was he permitted to continue a member of a society devoted to religious education ? why was he not expelled from it ? — When this circumstance was mentioned by way of recrimination, we applied to the Principal for the truth of it, and desired that he might be formally proceeded against. The Principal, so far from supporting the charge, declared that he had no objection to Mr. *Welling*’s character, nor had ever heard any ill of him. However the Vice-Chancellor and his assessors thought a charge of this nature, which they held in much greater detestation than you would represent them to do, ought to be thoroughly examined into ; he therefore ordered the two gentlemen, to whose testimony Mr. *Kay* appealed in support of it, viz. Mr. *Wrighte* and M. *Brown*, to attend him. He took their depositions upon oath,

a P. 21,

b P. 22.

and

and the whole of their evidence is contained in the following affidavits.

Oxford, } The information of WILLIAM WRIGHT, gentleman commoner of *St. Edmund-Hall* in the University of *Oxford*, taken on oath before me, DAVID DURELL, Doctor in Divinity, Vice-Chancellor, and one of his Majesty's justices of the peace in and for the said University, this twelfth day of March, 1768 ;

Who saith that on last *St. John's* day the baptist, (viz. the 24th of June, 1767,) he this informant was walking in *New College* gardens, and was there joined by *John Welling* and *Erasmus Middleton*, commoners of *Edmund-Hall* aforesaid, when he the said *Wright* perceiving the said *Welling* to be concerned in liquor, took occasion to expostulate with him thereon : a dispute then arose between the said *Welling* and *Middleton* concerning some points in religion, the particulars of which he this informant does not recollect, only that the miracles of *Moses* were introduced in the dispute ; when the said *Welling* addressing himself to the said *Middleton*, used some such expression as the following, " What, fool, do you believe in the miracles of *Moses* ? " or words to that effect, upon which he the said informant reproved him severely, and threatened him much. That night, or the next day, the said *Welling* came to ask

ask the said informant's pardon for his behaviour that day or the preceding day : upon which he the said informant told him, that if he again behaved in the like manner, he would acquaint the Vice-Principal with it, and added, that if he had thought he had been in earnest in regard to the expression, which had so much offended him the day before or that day, he would break all connection with him, or to that effect.

THE said informant further saith, that in several conversations he has had with the said *Welling*, he has taken occasion to examine into his real sentiments in regard to the miracles of *Moses*, and other points of revelation : when the said *Welling* has declared, and particularly in a late conversation, his unfeigned assent to, and belief of divine revelation in general, and of the miracles wrought by *Moses* in particular. And he the said informant saith, that he has no sort of reason to suspect the veracity of the said *Welling* in the said declaration.

WILLIAM WRIGHT.

Sworn before me on the day
and year above-written.

D. DURELL, Vice-Chancellor.

Oxford, The information of WILLIAM BROWN,
 } commoner of St. *Edmund-Hall*, within
 the University of *Oxford*, taken on oath
 before

before me, DAVID DURELL, Doctor in Divinity, Vice-Chancellor of the University, and one of his Majesty's justices of the peace in and for the said University, this twelfth day of March, 1768 ;

Who saith, that in several conversations he has had with *John Welling*, commoner of the said Hall, on religious subjects, he has found that he the said *Welling* has used many free expressions, which he does not now remember, but which argued a suspicion of a disbelief of divine revelation : but upon a very particular enquiry, made at repeated times by the said informant, into the said *Welling's* real opinion of the truth of all the divine revelations, he the said *Welling* hath as often declared his unfeigned assent to all revealed truth contained in the holy scriptures.

THIS informant further saith, that he has no reason now to suspect that the said *Welling* dissembled, when he solemnly declared his real belief of the truth of divine revelations ; and does not suspect his being in the least disaffected to the doctrines or discipline of the Church of *England*.

WILLIAM BROWN.

Sworn before me on the
day and year above-
written

D. DURELL, Vice-Chancellor.

THE

THE Vice-Chancellor having taken these depositions, made enquiry after Mr. *Welling* : but was informed that he was gone out of town, and would not return till Easter term ; he desired directions to him, but the Principal knew not where to address him. The Vice-Chancellor then proceeded to lay the above affidavits before the Heads of Houses ; who were of opinion that they did not contain sufficient matter for a public citation, but advised that the party accused should, on his return to the University, be summoned before them to give an account of his principles, and make such satisfaction as should appear to them proper and sufficient. Accordingly he waited on the Vice-Chancellor on the 8th of May, and shewed him a letter from Mr. *Higson*, in answer to an application he had made for Testimonials for holy Orders : wherein Mr. *H.* declared that he had no objection to signing such testimonials, provided he was assured by the Vice-Chancellor that he had given satisfaction to the University in respect to the charge of infidelity, which had been brought against him. He protested that there was no real foundation for this charge, and was very desirous to give all possible assurances of his innocence. The Vice-Chancellor told him that he must appear the day following before the Heads of Houses. He attended accordingly ; and being called in, was acquainted with the heinous nature of the crime laid to his charge, and

and underwent a very strict examination with respect to his religious principles. He expressed great concern for having laid himself open to the suspicion of infidelity, and declared before the Meeting the substance of what is contained in the affidavit here annexed; which was read by him publicly in the Convocation House the next day, before the Members of Congregation there assembled, exactly as it is here printed, and not in latin, as you assert in the note p. 23d. This is another instance of your asserting nothing upon hear-say evidence.

WHEREAS it hath been alleged upon oath before the Reverend the Vice-Chancellor, against me JOHN WELLING, that on the 24th of June, 1767, in conversation with Mr. *Wrighte* and Mr. *Middleton* of *Edmund-Hall* in this University, I made use of certain expressions tending to disparage the truth of revelation; and in particular the miracles of *Moses*: I do hereby declare my unfeigned assent to, and belief of, divine revelation in general, and of the miracles wrought by *Moses* in particular: And I do aver that I was intoxicated in liquor (for which very criminal excess I am most sincerely sorry) when I uttered those expressions; and whereas by the use of those expressions I have given but too just occasion of scandal and offence to the Vice-Chancellor and members of the

this University ; I do hereby ask pardon of them for the same ; and I do further most solemnly protest, that however unguarded I may have been in the use of those, or any expressions whatsoever concerning religion, they were not declarative of my real principles, in as much as those principles are, and ever have been, and I trust will ever continue to be, diametrically opposite to scepticism and infidelity, which from my heart I detest and abhor.

Witness my hand,

JOHN WELLING.

Sworn before me
the ninth day of
May, 1768.

D. DURELL, Vice-Chancellor.

WE whose names are underwritten, do certify that *John Welling* read the above declaration publicly in Congregation, this tenth day of May, 1768.

D. DURELL. Vice-Chancellor.

B. WHEELER, Senior Proctor.

E. WHITMORE, Junior Proctor.

LET me now ask you, what apology can you make to the Vice-Chancellor and Heads of Houses, whose characters you have aspersed, by a base infi-

E

nuation

uation that they prefer infidelity to methodism? what atonement to the University, which is greatly injured by your unjust and uncharitable censures? What answer to your own conscience, which must reproach you with having endeavoured to vilify the governors of this venerable seat of learning and piety, thereby weakening the hands of discipline, and wounding even religion herself?

In your note p. 79. you give us a particular history of the birth, life, and conversation of Mr. *W*—. How you have been able to trace this poor foundling beggar-boy through the several dark windings and dirty channels, through which he waded to the University; or how he ever got there by such arts, is a mystery to me. If your story be a true one, he is certainly a very detestable character, and not worthy to be a member of the University. But to what purpose have you introduced it here? With what view have you raked into this filthy kennel? His admission here under such circumstances can be no reflection on the Vice-Chancellor, who could not be supposed to be acquainted with them; it can be no reflection on his Tutor, in whose absence he was entered; who was quite unacquainted with his family and connections, who, and whence he was, and particularly made this an article of complaint. Neither can it reflect on those who signed his Testimonials for Orders, or on the Bishop, who ORDAINED HIM TO A CURE OF SOULS, unless you can suppose that

that they were previously acquainted with this dark side of his character ; which I am persuaded was entirely concealed from them, till you hung it out to public view ; whether in its proper colours or not, I leave himself to shew. This black story, which however I have good reason to believe is misrepresented, will indeed suggest one caution to the Heads of Colleges and Halls, viz. not to admit any one a member of their society, without enquiring into his family, his education, and morals. The Vice-Chancellor does this, as far as he prudently can, at the matriculation of every person : who gives an account of his age, quality, his father's name, and place of abode ; all which is registered in the matriculation-book, and supposed to be well known to the Governor or Tutor of the society into which he is entered.

IN YOUR REPLY you are still more illiberal and abusive, for, laying aside all regard to truth and decency, you represent the Vice-Chancellor as “ admitting the evidence of one, who had been “ convicted of open blasphemy, infidelity and “ drunkenness” and “ consenting that a Testimony should be given him notwithstanding he “ had been thus convicted.” The character of that man, when he gave his evidence, was fair and unsuspected : The Principal had, some time before the visitation, in conversation with me spoken much in his commendation, and complained that Mr. *Higson* had used him ill, by demanding who this Mr.

W— was, where he came from, and who were his friends or relations. And after the examination the Principal was appealed to (as I have before observed) and then likewise declared that he had no objection to Mr. *Welling*'s character, nor had ever heard any ill of him. Surely, sir, you do not consider where those arrows, which you aim at the Vice-Chancellor, must fall, and whom they must wound. But so that you wound —

Tros rutulusve fuat, nullo discrimine habebis.

I cannot help observing, that in tracing the above Mr. *W*— through his various scenes of life, you place him for some time “ in the family of a clergyman who was called a methodist, where he “ pretended to have a mighty zeal for religion.” This circumstance makes me less wonder at his subsequent conduct, as the folly of methodism naturally leads either to madness or infidelity.

I now proceed to the case of those gentlemen, who “ ^a were suffered to take their names out of the “ book of *Edmund-Hall*, and to enter at *Magdalen-Hall*; which you represent to be done in order to “ cast a greater stigma and opprobrium on *Edmund-Hall*, and the worthy Principal of it; and this, “ after Mr. Vice-Chancellor had told Mr. *Grove*, “ and solemnly given his word to the Principal, “ that unless the expelled young men were received “ again into the University, none of the others

^a P. 23.

“ should

“ should have liberty to leave his Hall, and to enter elsewhere.—*Heu! prisca fides!*” Is it thus you defend the cause of violated truth, and injured innocence? Is this your love of candor? this your reverence for authority; such an accusation brought against the chief magistrate of the University ought at least to be well supported, and urged with modesty. But you were conscious your cause required other arts than these; to apply your own quotation a

Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis
Tempus eget. —

Bold assertion must supply the place of proof, and vehement exclamation give the air of truth to falsehood; which however, upon the slightest touch will return to her proper shape, and appear in her own deformity. The real fact is this; Mr. Grove, after his expulsion, applied to the Vice-Chancellor to be re-admitted into some College or Hall, on condition of his making a recantation of his errors, and giving security to the University for his future good behaviour. The Vice-Chancellor referred him to the Chancellor, to whom he presented a petition; which was again referred by the Chancellor to the Vice-Chancellor; who, to oblige Mr. Grove, fixed upon the first vacant hour in the next day after he received it, in order to deliberate with his assessors upon the subject of it. At the same time they took into their consideration another petition, which had been presented by three gentlemen of the same

Hall to the° Chancellor, but was also referred to the Vice-Chancellor's determination. In regard to Mr. *Grove*, they were unanimous in their opinion that he ought not to be received again into the University: but with respect to the other petitioners, it was judged expedient that persuasion should be used to induce them to continue of the Hall, as the cause of their complaint had been removed by the late expulsion; and indeed also thro' motives of tenderness to the Principal, that by their continuance there that House might recover its credit. But if the method here recommended should prove ineffectual, they all agreed that the Vice-Chancellor would then be obliged to call upon the Principal (as the statute directs) to shew cause why their petition should not be granted.

MR. *Grove* called upon the Vice-Chancellor that evening for an answer; when he was told the Vice-Chancellor and his assessors could not consent to his being re-instated; and that the other gentlemen were not allowed for the present to leave the Hall. This was all that passed between them. The beginning of the week following the Principal of *Edmund - Hall* called upon the Vice-Chancellor to desire him to recommend a Tutor for his Hall: at which time the Vice-Chancellor acquainted him with the substance of what had passed at the meeting on the Saturday preceding; expressly adding that, if the gentlemen who had petitioned for leave to remove to another society, could not be prevailed

vailed on to continue of the Hall, he must expect to be called upon to give his reasons against their departure.

^a THIS is the exact state of the case: and if the Vice-Chancellor's bare word will not be admitted, he is ready to confirm it upon oath. He has since called upon the Principal, and, in my presence, questioned him in relation to the charge brought against him on this head. The Principal's answer was, that he understood the determination of both the petitions had been final; and did not remember that any thing more was said on the subject: but absolutely cleared the Vice-Chancellor of having made any promise, or having intimated a single word of any condition, on which the supposed breach of promise is founded. You will, I hope, do him the justice to retract what you have said, and beg his pardon for the injury you have done him.

ANOTHER petition was some time after presented to the Vice-Chancellor by six members of *Edmund-Hall*, desiring his leave to quit it: This he laid before the Heads of Houses at that meeting, in which an enquiry was made into Mr. *Welling's* affair, and sent for the Principal of the Hall to know what objection he had against granting it: but none being urged, at least none that was thought satisfactory, and the Principal still continuing to refuse them

^a For a farther discussion of this point I refer you to the Postscript.

leave

leave, the Vice-Chancellor put the question distinctly to all then present, who were not less than sixteen, whether they would advise him to give the petitioners the proper instrument for that purpose; when all (the Principal excepted) readily concurred to recommend the measure; and if you are at all acquainted with the statutes of the University, you must know that it was not in the Vice-Chancellor's power to make the promise you charge him with.

You assert that though Mr. *Grove* was expelled for preaching in a barn, yet "he really never did it, and absolutely denied it." Do you mean, sir, that he never preached at all? or that he did not preach in a barn? or a field? if the former; it was proved by undoubted evidence, and confessed by himself both at the examination and afterwards—though I am since informed that, in a petition presented to the late Archbishop, he has denied it. If the latter; it is a mere quibble, it being very immaterial whether the preachment was made in a barn, or on a common; not the place but the action was condemned. In p. 26 of your second edition you go farther, and say that when sentence was passed on Mr. *Grove*, "he denied the fact; however he was put down guilty of it by Dr. "N—ll." Now, sir, it will appear from my minutes, that I had not mentioned the word BARN—but that circumstance of the place was recollected

by the other assessors, and accordingly was inserted in the sentence by the Vice-Chancellor. To what, sir, am I to attribute your very remarkable attention to me? Time perhaps may explain it.

IN your REPLY, you tell the world that “ Dr. *Nowell* indeed admits that Mr. *Grove* did not “ preach in a Barn.” Pray, sir, where have I admitted it? Have I not expressly declared the contrary? by saying “ that though I had not mentioned the word BARN in my minutes, yet that “ circumstance of the place was recollected by the “ other assessors.”

MUCH of a piece with this is your proof that Mr. *Grove* had not denied to the Archbishop that he had preached.—“ That I may see how void of “ truth my information was that Mr. *Grove* denied his having preached &c. in his petition “ presented to the late Archbishop” — You insert his petition; in which there is not one single word of preaching or expounding; he confesses only “ that he has ATTENDED religious meetings, prohibited by the statutes of the University.” And yet he had more than once confessed to me after his expulsion, that he had preached to a large assembly of people. He virtually acknowledges indeed to the Archbishop that he had incurred the penalty of expulsion, “ by attending religious meetings PROHIBITED by the statutes of the University;” for the penalty in that case is expulsion; though he virtually denies that he PREACHED, not having made that

that a part of his confession : which he ought to have done, unless he meant to impose on the Archbishop by a partial representation of his crime.

WE come now to that article, on which you seem to lay the greatest stress, and display all your eloquence, shall I call it ? or rather virulence. You not only assert that all “^a the doctrines, which these “ six students were expelled for maintaining, are the “ very fundamental avowed doctrines of the Church “ of *England*; but call those who hold the contrary “ opinions, ^b a pestilent seditious sect, dangerous “ heretics and schismatics : ^c Incendiaries in the “ church who had impiously and hypocritically set “ their hands to doctrines, which in their hearts “ they never assented to: and call their opinions “^d the pride-foothing *Arminian* heresy, doctrines of “ devils; and rank them with the blasphemies of “ *Arius*, *Pelagius*, and *Socinus* : ^e you affirm them “ to be the known, avowed, received tenets of the “ Church of *Rome*, compared with which transubstantiation is an harmless error.” Is this the language of one guided by a spirit of wisdom, truth, love, and candor? Is it consistent with christian charity or decency? The points which you pronounce so confidently upon, are generally acknowledged to be abstruse and difficult points: and wise and good men have always differed about them. Less confidence therefore, and more charity

b P. 29.

b P. 33.

c *Ibid.*d *Ibid.*

e P. 73.

should

should have better become you. These points have been disputed in almost all ages of the christian church, both before and since the council of ^a *Trent*; among the Papists, between the *Thomists* and the *Scotists*; the *Dominicans* and the *Franciscans*: among the Protestants, from the first beginning of the reformation, between the Lutherans and the Calvinists. What pretence then have you to call your own notions the principles of the reformation, and the contrary opinions the avowed tenets of the Church of *Rome*? You ought to have known, that the doctrines against which you inveigh with so much bitterness, have been maintained by many of the brightest ornaments of our church, and the principal advocates against the errors of popery; such as *Laud*, *Hammond*, *Bull*, *Tillotson*, *Sharp*, *Stillingfleet*, and many others; and that our articles have been vindicated from the charge of Calvinism by Bp *Bull*, Dr. *Waterland*, and several other religious and learned men. Supposing that they, and we, are mistaken in the sense we put upon our articles, yet surely, unless you can see our hearts, you cannot censure us for subscribing to what we believe not a word of. The same railing accusations have been frequently brought against us by Arians and Socinians, and as frequently answered. They have been very lately urged with great bitterness in that virulent and abusive book called the *Confessional*. It is very strange that

^a See *F. Paul's Hist. of the Council of Trent*, b. ii.

you should repeat the same calumnies, which have been so lately and so fully answered in those three excellent letters addressed to the author of the Confessional, without taking any notice of the answers therein given.

BUT you tell us, that “^a the University of Oxford hath expelled her members for believing those very doctrines which *Cranmer* and *Ridley* were martyred within her walls for defending.” Here, sir, you make their expulsion an act of the University, though in your dedication you tell us, “that it is the highest injustice to that ancient and respectable seminary of true piety and learning to look upon it in this light.” In what light then must we look upon you, who are guilty of this injustice? But were *Cranmer* and *Ridley* martyred for maintaining these doctrines? and must we take your word for this? for you have not vouchsafed to give the least proof of it. I beg leave to tell you that *Cranmer* and *Ridley* were condemned and martyred for denying transubstantiation^b, the sacrifice of the mass, and the Pope’s supremacy. What their opinions were with regard to the doctrines of free agency &c. may be seen in the book called “*Pia et Catholica Institutio, or Erudition of a Christian*”

^a P. 27.

^b *Strype’s Mem. of Cranmer*, b. i. c. 20. *Dr. Ridley’s Life of Ridley*, b. v. 11.

^c The Latin Book, which has this title, *Pia et Catholica Christiani Hominis Institutio*, and was printed in the year 1544,

Man, published in 1543, by the King's authority, and authorized by the Bishops, with Abp *Cranmer* at the head of them.—With regard to free-will they thus expresse themselves :

“ The commaundmentes and threatnynges of
 “ Almyghtye God in scripture, whereby man is
 “ called upon, and put to remembrance, what
 “ God wold have him to do, most evidently do ex-
 “ presse and declare that man hath free-will also
 “ nowe after the falle of our first father *Adam*, as
 “ plainly appereth in these places following “ Be
 “ not overcome of evyll.” “ Neglect not the
 “ grace that is in the” “ Love not the world &c.”
 “ yf thou wylte enter into lyfe, keepe the com-
 “ maundementes.” Whyche undoubtedlye shulde
 “ be sayde in vayne, onelesse there were some fa-
 “ cultie or power left in man, whereby he may by

is a translation of a book printed in 1543, with this title, *A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian*, set furthe by the Kynges Majestie of England. It is called the King's book, being published by Him, with the approbation of both the Houses of Parliament. This book is formed upon the plan of another book, published in the year 1537, and called the Bishops' book, because it was assented to by the Bishops and many of the Lower House of Convocation, and by them dedicated to the King. These books in many instances are entirely the same, but differ from each other so frequently, that they are very properly to be esteemed as different books.

Strype's Mem. of Cranmer, b. i. c. 20. *Burnet's Hist. of the Reformation*, vol. i. 286, &c. *Ridley's Life of Ridley*, f. 345, &c.

“ the

“ the helpe and grace of God (if he wyll receyve it
 “ when it is offerde unto him) understand his com-
 “ maundementes, and freely consent and obey unto
 “ them; which thing of the catholike fathers is
 “ called FREE-WILL. And a little farther, describing
 “ the effects and consequences of the fall, they tell
 “ us that, besides many other evilles, that came by
 “ that transgression, the hyghe powers of mannes
 “ reason, and freedome of will, were wounded and
 “ corrupted, and all men thereby brought into
 “ such blindnes and infirmitie, that they cannot
 “ eschue synne, except they be illumined and made
 “ free by an especiall grace, that is to say, by a
 “ supernaturall helpe and working of the Holy-
 “ Goste, which although the goodnes of God of-
 “ fereth to all men, yet they only enjoye it, which
 “ by theyre free-will do accept and imbrace the
 “ same.” Again, “ St. *Augustine* also plainly de-
 “ clareth the same, saying, we conclude that free-
 “ wyll is in man after his fall, whiche thing whoso
 “ denieth is not a catholike man.” And they con-
 “ clude thus: “ Wherefore be men to be warned that
 “ they do not impute to God their vice or their
 “ damnation, but to themselves, whiche by free-
 “ will have abused the grace and benefites of God.”
 And admonish all preachers “ that in this highe
 “ mater, they lokinge on bothe sides, so attempre
 “ and moderate themselves, that neyther they so
 “ preache the grace of God, that they take away
 “ thereby free-will; nor on the other side so extolle
 “ free-will, that injury be done to the grace of God.”

In

In the article of justification they thus expresse themselves : “ So it it pleaseth the high wisdom of
 “ God, that Man, prevented by his grace (which
 “ being offered, man may if he will refuse or receive)
 “ shall be also a worker by his free consent
 “ and obedience to the same, in the attaining of
 “ his owne justification, and by Goddes grace and
 “ helpe, shall walke in such workes as be requisite
 “ to his justification, and so continuynge come to
 “ perfect ende thereof, by such means and waies as
 “ God hath ordeyned.” And therefore it is playne,
 “ that not only fayth, as it is a distinct vertue or
 “ gyft by it selfe, is required to our justification ;
 “ but also the other gyftes of the grace of God,
 “ with a desire to do good workes proceeding
 “ of the same grace. And whereas in certain
 “ places of scripture our justification is ascribed to
 “ fayth, without any further addition or mention
 “ of any other vertue or gift of God ; it is to be
 “ understood of fayth in the second acception,
 “ wherein the fear of God, repentance, hope and
 “ charitie will be included and comprised ; all which
 “ must be joyned together in our justification.”

With regard to election and perseverance, they fully declare the doctrine of the church in the following words : “ It is no doubt but although we
 “ be once justified, yet we may fall therefrom, by
 “ our own free-wyll and consenting unto sinne ;
 “ and following the desires thereof ; for albeit the
 “ the hous of our conscience be made clene, and
 “ the

“ the foull spirite be expelled from us in baptisme
 “ or penance ; yet if we waxe ydle and take not
 “ hede ; he will returne with seven worse spirites and
 “ possesse us agayn ; and although we be illumined
 “ and have tasted the heavenly gift, and be made
 “ partakers of the Holy Goste, yet may we fall and
 “ displease God ; wherefore as *St. Paul* sayeth,
 “ He that standeth, let him take hede that he
 “ fall not.”

“ And here all phantastickall imagination, cu-
 “ rious reasoning, and vain trust of predestination
 “ is to be laid apart, and according to the plain
 “ maner of speaking and teachyng of scripture, in
 “ innumerable places, we ought evermore to be
 “ in dread of our owne fraielyty, and natural pro-
 “ nity to fall to synne: and not to assure our-
 “ selfe that we be elected any otherwise than by
 “ feelyng of spiritual motions in our hart, and
 “ by the tokens of good and vertuous livyng, in
 “ following the grace of God, and perseveryng in
 “ the same to the ende.” Our article on predesti-
 nation refers us to the same rule, “ bidding us
 “ receive God’s promises in such wise as they be
 “ generally set forth in holy scripture.” Of which
 we cannot have a better illustration than what
 is contained in the preceding quotation. To which
 I will add another from their doctrine of faith,
 equally full and pertinent. “ Whether there be
 “ any special particular knowledge which man by
 “ sayth hath certainly of hymselfe, whereby he may
 “ testifie

“ he may testifie to hymselfe that he is of the pre-
 “ destinatedes which shall to the ende persevere in
 “ their calling, we have not spoken, ne cannot in
 “ scripture, ne doctours fynde that any suche fayth
 “ can be taught or preached.”

THE doctrine of UNIVERSAL REDEMPTION cannot
 be taught in plainer terms than the following. “ Our
 “ Saviour Christ hath offered hymselfe upon the
 “ Crosse a sufficient redemption and satisfaction
 “ for the synnes of all the world; and hath made
 “ hymself an open way and entre unto God the
 “ Father for all mankynd, only by his worthy
 “ merite and deservyng, and willyng all men to
 “ be saved, calleth upon all the world without
 “ respect of persons, to come and be partakers of
 “ the righteousnesse, peace, and glory, which is in
 “ hym.”

Lastly, on the article of GOOD WORKS, they ex-
 press themselves thus: “ These workes be of two
 “ sortes; for some be suche as men truly justified,
 “ and so continuing, do work in charitie of a pure
 “ hart, and a good conscience, and an unfayned
 “ faythe. Which workes although they be of
 “ themselves unworthy, unperfected and unsuffici-
 “ ent: Yet for as muche as they be done in the
 “ faythe of Christe, and by the vertue and merites
 “ of his passion, theyr unperfectednesse is supplied:
 “ the mercifull goodness of God accepteth them
 “ as an observation and fulfylling of his lawe, and
 F “ they

“ they be the very service of God, and be meritorious towards the atteyning of everlasting life.
 “ And these be called the workes and fruites of
 “ righteousnesse.”

You are pleased to be very ludicrous in your description of this book, and cry out with an air of insolence “ Wouldest thou believe it, reader? “ the first of these authorities, on the sleeve of “ which a Protestant Doctor of Divinity has pinned “ his faith, and refers to, is—this same *Pia et Catholica Institutio*, this same inconsistent indigested mass of romish absurdities.” Had you the least degree of candor, you would not have been guilty of so shameful a misrepresentation, nor have had the confidence to impose it on the reader. I quoted this book to shew you “ what were the “ sentiments of *Cranmer*, *Ridley*, and the first reformers on these points.” And surely I could not appeal to better authority, than to their own writings. The bishops who drew up this book were, most of them, such as had a principal hand in the reformation, and either drew up, or subscribed to, the articles of religion agreed upon in *Edward* the VIth’s time 1552. And at the head of them was *Cranmer*. If *Ridley* was not immediately engaged in that work, (which is far from being evident) yet may he fairly be presumed to have been consulted on that occasion; for he was chaplain to *Cranmer* at that time: a “ who made great use of

a Biog. Brit. Artic. *Ridley*. Note E.

“ him

" him in his studies at *Lambeth*, where he resided
 " with the Arch-bishop, and he removed with
 " him to his house at *Ford*, in the time of the
 " plague; where he had much private conversa-
 " tion with him about the present state of the re-
 " formation, and further progress necessary to
 " compleat it." And *Cranmer* and *Ridley* ever after
 acted together in the affairs of the reformation.

THAT this book was written against the errors of
 popery is evident from the best authorities. *Strype*
 gives the following account of it. " The pious
 " Archbishop (*Cranmer*) thought it highly condu-
 " cible to the christian growth of the common
 " people in knowledge and religion, and to disen-
 " tangle them from gross ignorance and supersti-
 " tion, in which they had been nursed up by their
 " popish guides, that the Ten commandments, the
 " Lord's Prayer, and the Creed, and the grounds
 " of religion should be explained orthodoxly, and
 " recommended to their reading. Wherefore he
 " consulting with the Lord *Cromwell* &c. procured
 " by a commission from the King, that the Bishops,
 " whom he particularly recites, and other Bishops,
 " and learned Divines should meet together, and
 " devise an wholesome and plain exposition upon
 " these subjects, and set forth a truth of religion,
 " purged of errors and heresies. — Accordingly
 " they met at the Archbishop's house at *Lambeth*—
 " In the disputations which happened among them
 " in this work, *Winchester*, the Pope's chief cham-

“ pion, with three or four other of the Bishops
 “ went about with all subtil sophistry to maintain
 “ all idolatry, heresy, and superstition &c. But
 “ at the last, whether overpowered with number,
 “ or convinced by the word of God, and consent
 “ of ancient authors, and the primitive church,
 “ they all agreed upon, and set their hands to this
 “ godly book of religion.” Here, sir, you have
 the reason assigned why *Gardiner* and *Bonner* set
 their hands to this work, though written against
 the errors of popery ; it is therefore very unfair
 in you to infer, that, because they signed it, there-
 fore it must be a popish book.

As a farther proof of the esteem this book was
 holden in by our first reformers, *Strype* adds,
 “ The opinion that the favourers of the gospel
 “ had of this book in those times, may appear by
 “ what I find in a manuscript of the life of this
 “ Archbishop by an unknown author, that wrote
 “ it soon after the said Archbishop’s death : — A
 “ godly book of religion not much unlike the
 “ book set forth by King *Edward VI.* except in
 “ two points; the one was the real presence of
 “ Christ’s body in the sacrament of the altar —
 “ the other error was of praying, kissing, and
 “ kneeling before images ;—which, saith he, was
 “ added by the King, after the Bishops had set their
 “ hands to the contrary.” I could produce many
 other authorities from our best divines, who have
 quoted

quoted it as I have, but the book does not stand in need of them.

I AM sensible indeed, that it contains some relicts of popish doctrines, which those champions of the reformation, who composed it, afterwards renounced. But this is so far from invalidating its authority in general, that it serves to confirm it, with respect to those points of doctrine, which they persevered to maintain even to death. For a proof of which I shall have recourse to their other works, written professedly against the Papists, which therefore, I presume, cannot be subject to the like objection.

FIRST then, *Cranmer* in his preface to his book against *Gardiner*, Bishop of *Winchester*, tell us, “ that our Saviour Jesus Christ came into this
“ world from the high throne of his father to declare unto miserable sinners good news &c. and
“ to preach, and give pardon and a full remission
“ of sinne to all his elected ; and to perform the
“ same, he made a sacrifice and oblation upon the
“ crosse, which was A FULL REDEMPTION AND
“ PROPITIATION FOR THE SINNES OF THE WHOLE
“ WORLD.” And in the conclusion of this preface, he thus expresses himself with regard to works : “ I
“ know what account I shall make to God hereof at
“ the last day ; when EVERY man shall answer for
“ his vocation, and receive for the same good or
“ ill, according AS HE HATH DONE.” And he con-

tinued to preach the same doctrine of universal redemption with his last breath; offering up at the stake the following prayer to God. The excellence, humility, and piety of which will be a sufficient apology for presenting it to the reader.

“ O Father of heaven; O Son of God, Redeemer
 “ of the world; O Holy Ghost, proceeding from
 “ them both, Three Persons and one God, have
 “ mercy upon me, most wretched caitiff, and mi-
 “ serable sinner. I, who have offended both hea-
 “ ven and earth, and more grievously than any
 “ tongue can express, whither then may I go, or
 “ whither should I fly for succour? To heaven I
 “ may be ashamed to lift up mine eyes, and in
 “ earth I find no refuge. What shall I then do?
 “ shall I despair? God forbid. O good God,
 “ thou art merciful, and refusest none that come
 “ unto thee for succour: To thee, therefore do
 “ I run. To thee do I humble myself, saying,
 “ O Lord God, my sins be great, but yet have
 “ mercy upon me, for thy great mercy. O God the
 “ Son, thou wast not made man, this great mys-
 “ tery was not wrought, for few or small offences,
 “ nor thou didst not give thy Son unto death, O
 “ God the Father, for our little and small sins
 “ only, but FOR ALL THE GREATEST SINS OF
 “ THE WORLD: so that the sinner return unto thee
 “ with a penitent heart; as I do at this present.
 “ Wherefore have mercy upon me, O Lord,
 “ whose property is always to have mercy. For
 “ although my sins be great, yet thy mercy is
 “ greater.

“ greater. I crave nothing, O Lord, for my
 “ own merits; but for thy name’s sake, that it
 “ may be glorified thereby: and for thy dear Son
 “ Jesus Christ’s sake.” Words cannot better ex-
 press the conditions upon which EVERY penitent
 sinner may humbly sue for pardon at the throne of
 grace, than what are contained in this prayer,
 which I earnestly recommend to every sincere
 christian.

LET us next see what were *Latimer’s* sentiments
 on these points — “ a We need not (says he) go
 “ about to trouble ourselves with curious ques-
 “ tions of the predestination of God; but let us
 “ rather endeavour ourselves, that we may be in
 “ Christ; for then we be in him, then are we
 “ well, and then we may be sure that we are
 “ ordained to everlasting life.—But you will say,
 “ how shall I know that I am in the book of life?
 “ how shall I try myself to be elect of God to
 “ everlasting life? I answer, first, we may know
 “ that we be one time in the book, and another
 “ time come out again; as appeareth by *David*,
 “ which was written in the book of life; but
 “ when he sinned, he at the same time was out

a Serm. on the third Sunday after Epiphany.

You say there is nothing in these passages, or those quoted
 from the *Reformatio Legum*, but what you readily acquiesce in;
 But if you are ready to subscribe to these doctrines, and yet retain
 your calvinistical notions, I fear you will incur the censure of
 “ setting your hand to doctrines, which in your heart you do
 “ not assent to.”

“ of

“ of the book of the favour of God, until he
 “ had repented, and was sorry for his faults.
 “ So we may be in the book one time, and after-
 “ ward, when we forget God and his word, and
 “ do wickedly, we come out of the book, that is
 “ out of Christ. And in that book are written all
 “ believers. But I will tell you how you shall
 “ know when you are in the book : and there are
 “ three special notes, whereby you may know the
 “ same ; and the first note is, that you know your
 “ sin, and feel your own wretchedness ; then fol-
 “ loweth the second point ; which is faith in Christ ;
 “ that is, when you believe most stedfastly and un-
 “ doubtedly, that God the heavenly Father thro’
 “ his Son will deliver you from your sins. The
 “ third point is, when you have an earnest desire
 “ to amendment, and hatred against sin, and study
 “ to live after God’s will and commandments, as
 “ much as is possible for you to do.” — Again —
 “ ^a The promises of Christ our Saviour are gene-
 “ ral : he made a general proclamation, saying,
 “ whosoever believeth on me hath everlasting life.
 “ He saith, come to me all ye that labour and are
 “ laden, and I will ease you.—Mark, here he saith,
 “ come ALL ye ; wherefore then should any man
 “ despair, or shut himself out from the promises
 “ of Christ, which be general, and pertain to the
 “ whole world ? He that leaveth his wickedness
 “ and sins, is content to amend his life, and be-

a Sermon on Matt. xxii. 2, &c.

“ lieving

“ lieving in Christ, seeketh salvation and everlasting life by him, no doubt that man or woman, “ whosoever he or they be, shall be saved.—And again — “ a Christ shed as much blood for *Judas*, “ as he did for *Peter*; *Peter* believed it, and therefore he was saved; *Judas* would not believe, and “ therefore he was condemned, the fault being in “ him only, and in nobody else.” And, pointing out the ill use which the gospellers in his time made of predestination, which brought them (as the holy martyr expressed it) to desperation or carnal liberty, he concludes, “ it was needful to beware of such expositions of the scripture, as of “ the devil himself.”

BUT for a full declaration both of *Latimer's* and *Ridley's* sentiments concerning universal redemption, I refer you to their conference with each other, held a little before their martyrdom, in which they used the following argument against the sacrifice of the mass, “ if Chryste offered in his “ supper, for whome I praye you? for all: or (as “ it is in the MS.) FOR EVERY MAN. Then his “ latter oblation made on the crosse, cannot be “ thought to be done for ALL men, for it was not “ done for them for whom the oblation was made “ in the supper; except peradventure he offered “ twice for the selfe same. And that shulde argue “ the unperfectnesse of the sacrifice.” The force

a Exposit. of the Ten Commandments.

of

of the above argument consists in this position — that Christ offered himself for every Man. If he made this offering in the last supper for any, then were those persons excluded in the offering upon the cross, unless he offered twice for the same persons. An irrefragable argument this, both against the sacrifice of the mass, and for the universal redemption purchased by the offering of Christ once offered on the cross. This surely will silence all your cavils about the real sentiments of these great men, being alone equal to a thousand arguments. Yet because you pique yourself upon *Ridley's* having written a treatise on God's election and predestination, I think myself obliged to explain this matter more largely than otherwise might have been necessary. The free-willers, of whom *Bradford* complains, held (as he himself sets forth) the error of the Pelagians, concerning man's free-will, and therefore were justly censured for excluding the necessity of divine grace. But with respect to God's election and predestination, the Bishop, in answer to *Bradford*, has these words.

“ Know you, that concerning the matter you
 “ mean, I have in latin drawn out the places of
 “ the scriptures, and upon the same have noted
 “ what I can for the time. Syr, in these matters
 “ I am so fearful, that I dare not speak farther,
 “ yea almost none otherwise than the very text
 “ doth (as it were) lead me by the hand.”

Which is, in other words, saying only what the 17th article declares, viz. that we must receive
 God's

God's promises in such wise, as they be generally set forth to us in holy scripture. You would have done well, sir, to have adopted the caution of the Bishop; and, as this work is no where extant, you ought by every fair rule of interpretation to suppose, that his sentiments on this subject were consistent with his doctrines expressed in his other writings. But I am not at all surprized that you, who have the confidence to tell me, that the above extracts from Bishop *Latimer's* sermons really confirm the doctrine of predestination, should impose upon the reader by inferring that, because Bishop *Ridley* "wrote a particular treatise on God's election and predestination," he must necessarily hold the Calvinistical tenets, and by pretending, in support of your inference, to have recourse to that work which you never saw.

To these let me add the holy martyr Bishop *Hooper*, who insists strongly on the doctrine of universal redemption throughout the preface to his declaration of the Ten commandments. The whole is worth reading; I shall select some passages. He saith, "that as far extendeth the virtue and strength of God's promise to save men, as the rigour and justice of the law for sin to damne men; for as by the sin and offence of one man death was extended and made common unto all men unto condemnation, as *Paul* saith, Rom. v. so by the justice of one is derived life unto all men unto justification. If
" all

“ all then shall be saved, what is to be said of those
 “ that *St. Peter* speaketh of, that shall perish for
 “ their false doctrine? and likewise *Christ* saith,
 “ that the gate is streight that leadeth to life, and
 “ few enter. *Matt. vii.* Thus the scripture an-
 “ swereth, that the promise of grace appertaineth
 “ unto every sorte of men in the world, and com-
 “ prehendeth them all, howbeit within certain li-
 “ mits and bounds, the which if men neglect, or
 “ pass over, they exclude themselves from the
 “ promise in *Christ*: ^a As *Cain* was no more ex-
 “ cluded, till he excluded himself, than *Abel*;
 “ *Saul* than *David*; *Judas* than *Peter*; *Esau* than
 “ *Jacob*.” This holy man goes on to explain *Rom.*
ix. and shews that the acceptation of *Jacob*, and
 reprobation of *Esau* was only concerning the pro-
 mises of the earth, not that *Esau* was disherited of
 eternal life, but that he should be inferior to his
 brother *Jacob* in this world, which prophecy was
 fulfilled in their posterities, and not in the persons
 themselves. — Again — “ It is our office to see
 “ we exclude not ourselves from the general grace
 “ promised to all men. It is not a christian man’s
 “ part to attribute his salvation to his own free will
 “ with the Pelagian, and to extenuate original sin:

^a *Gen. iii. 5, 6, 7.* But unto *Cain* and his offering he had
 not respect, and *Cain* was very wroth, and his countenance fell.
 And the Lord said unto *Cain*, why art thou wroth? and why
 is thy countenance fallen? If thou doest well SHALT THOU
 NOT BE ACCEPTED? and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at
 the door.

“ Nor

“ Nor to make God the author of ill, and our
 “ damnation, with the Manichee. Nor yet to say
 “ God hath written fatal laws, as the Stoic; and
 “ with the necessity of destiny violently pulleth one
 “ by the hair into heaven, and thrusteth the other
 “ headlong into hell. But ascertain thyself by the
 “ scripture, what be the causes of reprobation, and
 “ what of election. The cause of rejection or
 “ damnation is sin in man, which will not hear,
 “ neither receive the promises of the gospel, will
 “ not study to live thereafter, &c. So we judge
 “ of election by the event, or success that happen-
 “ eth in the life of man: those only to be elected
 “ that by faith apprehend the mercy promised in
 “ Christ, otherwise we should not judge of elec-
 “ tion. For *Paul* saith plainly, *Rom. viii.* that they
 “ that be led by the spirit of God are the chil-
 “ dren of God, and that the spirit of God doth
 “ testify with our spirits, that we are the children
 “ of God. Being admonished by the scripture we
 “ must leave sin, and do the works commanded of
 “ God, or else it is a carnal opinion, that we have
 “ blinded ourselves withal, of fatal destiny, and
 “ will not save us.”

AND the same opinions bishop *Ridley* seems to
 have held: for in a treatise of his published by Mr.
Fox in his acts and monuments, he thus interprets
 that text, 1 *John* iii. 9. whosoever is born of God
 doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in
 him

him ; “ he meaneth so long as that seed doth abide
“ in him, he cannot sin.”

THE same doctrine is taught in the ^a Reformatio Legum, published by our first reformers. There we read “ ^b Quapropter omnes nobis admonendi
“ sunt ut in actionibus suscipiendis ad decreta præ-
“ destinationis se non referant, cum et promissi-
“ ones bonis, et minas malis, in sacris scripturis
“ generaliter propositas contemplemur ^c.” Again,
“ ^d Etiam illi de justificatis perversè sentiunt, qui
“ credunt illos, postquam iusti simul facti sunt, in
“ peccatum non posse incidere ; aut si forte quic-

^a This Reformatio Legum was drawn up by commissioners appointed by King *Edward VI.* It is a system of ecclesiastical laws, and is supposed to have been compiled chiefly by Archbishop *Cranmer*, who was at the head of that commission. The King dying soon after, these laws were never confirmed by any authority, nor were they published till the reign of Queen *Elizabeth.* They were then published by *John Fox*, with King *Edward's* commission bearing date Nov. 11. 1551. See *Strype's Mem. Vol. II. b. ii. p. 303.* Life of *Cranmer*, b. ii. c. 26. p. 270. *Burnet's Hist. Ref. Vol. II. p. 2. b. i. p. 196, &c.*

^b “ Wherefore all are to be admonished by us that in their
“ undertakings and actions, they are not to refer themselves to
“ the decrees of predestination, since in the holy scriptures we
“ see promises to good actions, and threats to bad ones, pro-
“ posed in general terms.”

^c De Heres. cap. 32.

^d “ They form very perverse notions of the justified, who
“ believe that after they are once made just, they cannot fall into
“ sin ; or, if by chance they should do any thing prohibited by
“ the laws of God, that God does not impute it as sin.”

“ quam

“quam eorum faciunt quæ Dei legibus prohibentur, ea Deum pro peccatis non accipere^a.”

If then we may be permitted to form our judgment of the doctrines which *Cranmer*, *Ridley*, and our first reformers held and maintained, from their own writings and not from your assertions, the University of *Oxford*,^b once the nursing mother of so many faithful sons of the Anglican church, is still worthy of that high character, and has by this act of discipline approved herself such.

CONSCIOUS of the force of the above quotations, you endeavour to divert the reader's attention from them, by insinuating “that my design in bringing these authorities was to cast a slander upon the pure and holy doctrine of election, and to make the deceived reader believe that it leads to licentiousness of living; a stale calumny, which has been answered again and again:” I produced them to prove the point in dispute: but you seem sensible that they likewise prove the other charge, which is not more stale, than true, though I had forbore to urge it. But now, being thus called upon, I think myself obliged to support it, by that evidence, which I dare say you will not dispute, the evidence of the council of *Dort*. In which it is asserted, “that God will preserve in the faith all those who are

^a De Hæres cap. 9.

^b P. 27.

“absolutely

“absolutely elected from eternity, and are in time
 “brought to faith by an Almighty and irresistible
 “operation or working, so that though they fall
 “into detestable wickedness and villanies, and con-
 “tinue in the same some space of time, against
 “their conscience, yet the said villanies do not hin-
 “der, so much as a straw amounteth to, their
 “election or salvation; neither do they, or can
 “they by means of, or because of these, fall from
 “the grace of adoption, and from the state of jus-
 “tification, or lose their faith; but all the sins how
 “great soever they be, both which heretofore they
 “have committed, and those which after they will,
 “or shall commit, are surer than assuredly forgiven
 “them; yea and moreover they themselves at last,
 “though it be at the last gasp, shall be called to
 “repentance, and brought into possession of sal-
 “vation.^a” — What can be more horrid and
 impious? What greater licence to sin can the
 Pope by all his pardons and indulgences grant,
 than is here offered, (I tremble to mention it)
 under sanction of the decrees of God himself?
 They who have once been brought to faith by
 an irresistible operation, may, it seems, be guilty
 of the most detestable wickedness and villanies,
 may go on with security in the commission of
 sin, and after a life devoted to the devil and his
 works, yet shall Surer than ASSUREDLY be for-
 given and brought into possession of salvation.

^a *Heylin Hist. Quinq-Art. Part II. Ch. XIV.*

UNDER this delusion *Oliver Cromwell* acted all his villany, waded thro' slaughter to a throne, and imbrued his hands in his Sovereign's blood; and at last left the world with all his sins about him, in full assurance that he was safe, "because he was "once in a state of grace;" under this delusion the other regicides openly avowed, and gloried in their treason, rebellion, and murther; under the same delusion the fanatics of these times — but I forbear; and pray God to avert the judgments which seem to threaten this nation.

THAT these doctrines are consistent with our articles of religion, and the homilies of our church, will be shewn in its proper place. But before I proceed to the discussion of this point, it will be proper to consider the authority of that evidence by which you endeavour to support the contrary doctrines of predestination, reprobation, &c. as the genuine doctrines of the Church of *England*. And first you infer it from the censures inflicted upon Mr *Barrett* of *Caius* College, *Cambridge*, for which we have the authority of that loyal and godly author Mr *Prynne*. To the like objections urged by the author of the Confessional, I shall give the answer already given by the Letter-writer. " ^a Mr *Strype* in his life of "*Whitgift*, p. 435. saith, that till about the year "1595, *Calvin's* way of explaining the divine de-

^a Letter 3d, p. 99.

“ crees was not entertained by many learned men
 “ in the University of *Cambridge*. But these opi-
 “ nions were introduced by some of our divines,
 “ who, during the persecution under *Queen Mary*,
 “ had fled to *Geneva* and *Zurich*. There they im-
 “ bibed much *Calvinism* in church government and
 “ discipline, and some rigid opinions in point of
 “ doctrine : and *Dr. Whitaker* being made *Queen’s*
 “ Professor of Divinity at *Cambridge*, and *Dr. Hum-*
 “ *phreys* at *Oxford*, these opinions prevailed much
 “ in both the Universities, about the latter end of
 “ *Queen Elizabeth’s* reign. But “ ^a although Cal-
 “ vinism prevailed much in her reign both in the
 “ schools, and in the pulpit, yet it was not un-
 “ derstood to be certainly the sense of our arti-
 “ cles even by those who held this doctrine ; for
 “ though they thought fit to censure *Barrett*, they
 “ durst not venture to assert that his opinions
 “ were contrary to our articles ; for in their letter
 “ to the Archbishop ^b they say, that they are
 “ fully persuaded that *Barrett* had taught un-
 “ truth, if not against the articles, yet against the
 “ religion of our church, publicly received and
 “ always held in her Majesty’s reign, and main-
 “ tained in all sermons, disputations, and lectures.”
 And even this plea (weak as it would have been,
 though true) was utterly false, and directly contrary
 to the Archbishop’s declaration : nay they plainly

^a Letter 3, p. 35.

^b P. 35.

Strype’s Life of Whitgift, App. N°. 25.

acknowledge

acknowledge that these points were not concluded and defined by public authority ; and in their second admonition to the parliament, p. 34. they confess, “ indeed the book of articles speaketh “ very dangerously of falling from grace, which “ is to be reformed, because it too much inclineth “ to their error.”—Meaning the error of those who now are called Arminians.

THE Archbishop, censured their rash and hasty proceedings against *Barrett*, for that in some points of his retractation they had made him to affirm that “ which was contrary to the doctrine holden and “ expressed by many sound and learned divines in “ the Church of *England*, and in other Churches “ likewise, men of best account ; and that which, “ for his own part, he thought to be false and contrary to the scriptures ; for the scriptures were “ plain, that God by his absolute will did not hate “ and reject any man without an eye to his sin ; “ there might be impiety in believing the one, “ there could be none in believing the other ; neither was it contrary to any article of religion established by authority in the Church of *England*, “ but rather agreeable thereunto.”

As a farther proof that the Archbishop censured them for condemning *Barrett's* tenets, as such, and not MERELY because they had interfered in matters

^a *Strype's Life of Whitgift*, p. 441.

which belonged to his province, as you assert, I refer you to Dr. *Saravia's* censure of *Barret's* retraction, (Appendix, Numb. xxiv. P. 189.) whom the Archbishop, as *Strype* observes, had consulted on this occasion, "and who gave his judgment at large hereof in latin; with no more approbation THAN THE ^a ARCHBISHOP HAD DONE."

AND that these doctrines were not then universally held appears farther from the "^b learned *Hooker's* sermons at the *Temple*, where he preached what you call Arminianism; "that predestination "was not the absolute will of God, but conditional; that the doings of the wicked were not of "the will of God positive, but only permissive; "that reprobates are not rejected but for the evil "works which God did foresee they will commit." And when his opponent called for his authorities in expounding St. *Paul* against the judgment of all churches and all good writers, *Hooker* replied, "that the sentences which he might have cited "out of all church confessions, together with "the best learned monuments of former times, "and not the meanest of our own, were more in "number than perhaps he willingly would have "heard of^c."

^a See likewise the Archbishop's Letter to Lord *Burleigh*, P. 450. ^b Let. 2, P. 36, 37.

^c Answer to *Travers's* Supplication, sect 22. & 23.

To evade the force of *Hooker's* testimony you appeal to a posthumous sermon, wherein the doctrine of the indefectibility of God's grace is strongly asserted. If *Hooker* meant only to evince that God's promise standeth sure, and that he will never forsake his faithful servants, I readily subscribe to his doctrine. But if he meant to maintain that they, who had once been enlightened by the Spirit of God, can never fall away through their own wickedness or apostacy; such an assertion is not reconcileable with his answer to *Travers*, published in his lifetime; where, besides what I have already quoted, he says. "secondly, to their objection, who say, "if I be elected, do what I will, I shall be saved; "I had answered, that the will of God in this "thing is not absolute, but conditional, to save "his elect, believing, fearing, and obediently "serving him." And in his sermon of the certainty of faith &c, he thus expresses himself— "Do the promises of God concerning our stability "think you, make it matter indifferent for us to "use the means whereby to attend, or not to attend to reading; to pray, or not to pray, that "we fall not into temptation? Surely, if we look "to stand in the faith of the sons of God, we must "hourly, continually, be providing, and setting "ourselves to strive:—To our own safety, our "own sedulity is required."—I hope you will no longer press the judicious *Hooker* into your ser-

vice, who has so well defended the doctrine of universal redemption.

IN the next place we are presented with the famous *Lambeth* articles; which we have nothing to do with, they being no part of our faith, nor ever established by any legal authority, but rather forced upon the University in opposition to that authority. These too are urged against us by the author of the Confessional, and every thing that he or you have said, is fully answered by the Letter-writer^a. These articles were drawn up by Dr. *Whitaker* and other *Calvinists* of *Cambridge*. And the reason why they drew them up was, because the 39 articles were not sufficient for their purpose, “ those points being
 “ (as they themselves acknowledged) not concluded
 “ and defined by public authority.” The good Archbishop, though he had before expressed his dislike of their proceedings against *Barrett*: yet was prevailed upon to agree to these articles for the sake of peace; “ praying to take care that nothing
 “ should be publicly taught to the contrary; and
 “ that also in teaching them discretion and moderation should be used, that such as should be in
 “ some points differing in judgment, might not be
 “ of purpose stung, or justly grieved: And that
 “ the propositions nevertheless must be so taken
 “ and used as their PRIVATE judgments, thinking
 “ them to be true and correspondent to the doc-

^a Third letter, p. 61, 76, &c.

“ trine professed in the Church of *England*, and
 “ established by the laws of the land; and not as
 “ laws and decrees ^a.” But these articles gave
 great offence, not only in the University, but at
 Court. The Queen was greatly displeased with
 them. And therefore the Archbishop wrote to
Cambridge, “ desiring the Vice-Chancellor so to use
 “ the said propositions as there might be no publi-
 “ cation of them otherwise than in private.” Not-
 withstanding which the Queen resented what the
 Archbishop and the rest had done, and commanded
 her secretary to send unto his Grace, to acquaint
 him, “ that she misliked much that any allowance
 “ had been given by his Grace, and the rest, of any
 “ such points to be disputed, being a matter tender
 “ and dangerous to weak ignorant minds: and
 “ thereupon that she required his Grace to suspend
 “ them ^b.” And Lord *Burleigh*, Chancellor of the
 University reprimanded the Heads of Houses on

a *Strype's Life of Whitgift*, p. 462. By your quotation of
 this passage in your REPLY, p. 81. you shamefully pervert the
 Archbishop's meaning, making him say, “ that they are not to
 “ be looked upon as NEW laws and decrees — but as ALREADY
 “ established.” Whether this artifice be your own, or you only
 copied the forgery of *Neal*, your conduct is equally inexcusa-
 ble: for you impose it upon the reader as the words of *Strype*,
 who has given us the genuine letter, from which my quotation
 is taken.

b Ibid. c. 18. *Heylin's Hist. Presb.* b. x. §. 7. *Hist. of
 Lamb. art.*

this

this occasion, telling them “as good and ancient were
 “of another judgment :” and that as for *Baro* whom
 they had censured, “Ye may punish him, (says he)
 “if ye will; but ye shall do it for well doing, in
 “holding the truth in my opinion^a,” And he de-
 livered his opinion, to the Queen both of the doc-
 trine itself and its pernicious consequences, consi-
 dered even in a civil view, thus; “^b It is not,
 “saith he, difficult to perceive what these men aim
 “at, for they think and teach that whatever human
 “transactions are carried on, whether good or bad,
 “they are all bound up by the law of an immutable
 “decree; and that this necessity is imposed even
 “upon the wills of men, that they cannot will other-
 “wise than they do will. If these opinions, most au-
 “gust Sovereign, be true, in vain both myself and
 “your Majesty’s other faithful servants anxiously,
 “and with much hesitation, deliberate what upon
 “every occasion ought to be done, what may be most
 “conducive to your own welfare and that of the
 “kingdom: since all consultation must be fool-
 “ish and vain concerning these matters, which
 “must necessarily happen.” ‘Nay we are told,
 that the Queen threatened the Archbishop with
 a premunire for what he had done in these mat-
 ters. And thus these articles were suppressed.
 And when afterwards at the conference at *Hamp-*
ton-court, it was moved to add these assertions to

^a *Strype’s Life of Whitgift*, p. 441. *Heylin’s Hist.* b. xi,
 §. 5. ^b See *Ellis Lamb.* art. Hist. p. 7. ^c *Ibid.*

the book of the 39 articles, this proposal was rejected. To what purpose then do you urge the authority of the *Lambeth* articles, to which we never subscribed, which were never established, nor intended as laws for public use, but only as a temporary expedient to procure peace at that time at *Cambridge*, and which were recalled as soon as published? Had you been acquainted with the history of them, how they were first obtained and imposed, and afterwards suppressed, you would certainly have thought it more prudent, not to have mentioned them.

STILL less to your purpose are the questions and answers bound up with some old bibles. If any bishops, or others concerned in publishing an edition of the bible, shall think fit to annex a system of their own notions to it, this does not make their notions gospel, or give them the sanction of public authority. But that these questions and answers were bound up in all the editions of Queen *Elizabeth's* bible is not true. They appear in neither of Archbishop *Parker's* editions, nor in *Barker's* of 1599. You will, I believe, find some difficulty in reconciling your account with chronology. You tell us they were bound up with the only bible in use in Queen *Elizabeth's* time; and in confirmation of it produce the edition of 1607, some time after the Queen's death. I do not so much wonder that they should have crept into some editions of the bible in K. *James I.* reign, when the puritans began to
take

take greater liberties in imposing their tenets ; though it should seem from the edition (or rather new version) published by that King's authority in 1611, in which these questions and answers are not inserted, that they were then discountenanced.

BUT to be more particular.—^a In page 45, the last paragraph, and page 49, you assert what is not true — “ That these questions and answers “ concerning predestination—were always printed “ at the end of the old testament, and bound up “ and sold *cum privilegio*, with this authorized translation of the bible, till about the year 1615”—. It appears from p. 45, that you mean the BISHOPS' BIBLE. “ I apprehend these questions &c. were “ never bound up with the Bishop's bible, at least “ *Lewis* in his history of the translations of the bible “ from p. 235 to 264, mentions eight editions of it, “ and takes no notice of these questions &c. being “ printed with them, and he is very particular in “ giving the contents of them. But, as will appear “ hereafter, he takes particular notice when they were “ inserted in the *Geneva* bible. A friend of mine has “ the best edition of the Bishop's bible printed in “ 1572, fol. which has some corrections of the first “ edition of it in 1568. In that edition the questions “ &c. do not appear. Nor indeed could they with

^a The following account of this matter was communicated to me by a very judicious friend, who is well acquainted with the several editions of the bible, and the occasions of them.

“ any consistency appear there; for Archbishop
 “ *Parker*, the great promoter of this translation, in
 “ his preface asserts the direct opposite to the third
 “ question and answer. He asserts there — after
 “ quoting the text, Search the scriptures, for in them
 “ &c. These wordes were first spoken unto the
 “ *Jewes* by our Saviour, but by him in his doctrine
 “ ment to al: for they concerne al, of what nation,
 “ of what tongue, of what profession soever any
 “ man be. For to al belongeth it to be called unto
 “ eternal lyfe, so many as by the witnesse of the
 “ scriptures desire to finde eternal lyfe. No man,
 “ woman, or chylde, is excluded from this salva-
 “ tion, and therefore to every of them is this spoken,
 “ proportionally yet, and in their degrees, and ages,
 “ and as the reason and congruities of their vocation
 “ may ask.” Again a little lower after quoting
 “ *Josuah* 1. v. 8. He adds “ Yet as wel spake almightie
 “ God this precept to al his people in the directions
 “ of their wayes to hymwarde, as he ment it to
 “ *Josuah*: For that he hath care of al, he accepteth
 “ no man’s person, his wyl is that al menne should
 “ be saved, his wyl is that al menne should comme
 “ to the way of trueth: How could this be more
 “ conveniently declared by God to man, than when
 “ Christ his wel beloved Son our most loving
 “ Saviour, the way, the trueth, and the lyfe of us
 “ al, dyd byd us openly iearche the scriptures,
 “ assuring us herein to finde eternal life, to finde
 “ ful testification of al his graces and benefits
 “ towardes us in the treasure thereof? Therefore it
 is

“ is most convenient that we should al suppose that
 “ Christe spake to us al in this his precept of
 “ searhing the scriptures.” How then do you
 make it out, that these questions and answers touch-
 ing the doctrine of predestination were, by order of
 the said godly Bishops, bound up with this same
 bible? Or how do these questions and answers
 clearly demonstrate the sense of our Church
 touching the doctrines in question? It should seem
 from the above quotations, that the doctrine of
 our Church, at that critical time, was directly
 opposite to what is contained in the questions
 and answers, viz. the doctrine of universal re-
 demption.

THEY declare the sentiments of the Archbishop
 so clearly, that no comment, or art you can make
 use of, will be able to obscure them. And if you
 will read the “ Summe of the whole scripture”
 prefixed to this bible, you will perceive that these
 godly Bishops entirely agree with me in the other
 points of doctrine. I shall trouble the reader only
 with the following extracts, recommending the
 whole to his perusal at his leisure. “ Finally
 “ Christ hymself came into the world to the intent
 “ that we through him being sanctified and cleansed
 “ from our finnes, following his will in good workes,
 “ should denie the thinges pertheyning to the fleashe,
 “ and freely serve hym in righteousnesse and holynesse
 “ all the dayes of our lyfe; and that by good works
 “ (which God hath prepared for us to walke in) we
 “ should

“should shew ourselves to be called to his grace and
 “gyft of fayth; which good workes whoſo hath
 “not, doeth ſhewe hymſelf not to have ſuch a fayth
 “in Chriſte as is required of us.” Soon after fol-
 lows the account of the general judgment, “when
 “Chriſt ſhall render to EVERY man the workes
 “of his body, according to that he hath done,
 “whether it be good or evyl.”

HAD you quoted the whole note on *Rom. ix.*
 11. you would have enabled the reader to detect
 your miſrepresentation of it; which is of a piece
 with the inference you have drawn from their pre-
 face, where we have the following words, “God
 “hath decreed to give to his elect lyfe everlaſting,
 “and to the reprobate, WHO HATH CONTEMNED
 “HIS LIFE AND DOCTRINE, death everlaſting;”
 the obvious ſenſe of which is, that they alone are
 reprobate, who wilfully contemn Chriſt’s life and
 doctrine; which is the expreſs language of ſcrip-
 ture; all thoſe who obey it are his elect.

FROM page 264 to page 276, *Lewis* gives an
 account of the editions of the *Geneva* bible. The
 firſt of which, printed in *England*, was in 1572. It
 appears p. 234. of *Lewis*, from a letter of Archbi-
 ſhop *Parker*, that this bible was never intended
 for public uſe, but admitted to be printed for
 the uſe of private families. The firſt edition prin-
 ted at *Geneva* was in the year 1560. *Lewis* p.
 276 takes notice, that in one printed 1583, fol.
 certaine

certain questions and answers touching the doctrine of predestination, &c. were inserted. He adds in a note — “ These, I observe, were re-
 “ printed in the editions, 4to. 1592, 1615,” ’Tis probable these questions and answers might be first joined to the *Geneva* bible of 1583. That they were not always printed with it, an edition of it in 1599, 4to. in my possession can testify. These questions and answers therefore can only demonstrate the sense of the church of *Geneva*, or of the followers of that church, touching the doctrines in question.

THE confession of faith quoted by you p. 53, is bound up at the end of my *Geneva* bible of 1599. Therefore you conclude a little too fast, that the doctrines mentioned in it — “ are the ancient, un-
 “ doubted, received tenets of the Church of *Eng-*
 “ *land*.” I know not that it ever was joined to the authorized translations.

You are unwilling to confess “ that you have
 “ concluded too fast,” and therefore eagerly embrace any shadow of an argument in support of your conclusion — “ there is not, say you, the
 “ least reason to doubt but that this confession of
 “ faith, which is so point blank against your own
 “ creed, was originally drawn up by the reformers
 “ of the church of *England*, and has ever since
 “ been admitted, as containing the doctrines of
 “ that church.” BECAUSE (I beg the reader will observe

observe this very extraordinary proof) “you copied it from a bible printed at *Cambridge*, by the “King’s authority ann. 1663. with the *Bartholomew* “act prefixed.” And will this entirely take away all suspicion of puritanism? Had you copied it from the Bishops bible; had you found it mentioned in any of the histories of the reformation; had you seen it recorded in any of the public acts of the church—this I confess, had been some degree of evidence in its favour. But you find it in a bible printed at *Cambridge* &c, 1663. And this you think a sufficient ground to build your conclusion on. Let us see then whether we cannot trace it higher, for you are gotten into modern times. You might, sir, have copied it from the *Geneva* bible printed in 1599. which has *I. Tomson’s* new testament bound with it; and the singing psalms, to which this confession is annexed: and, I believe, you will in every instance, where it appears, find it so annexed. Now, sir, the singing psalms being no part of the bible, and being the property of the stationer’s company, I apprehend you will have no information from the printing houses either of *Oxford* or *Cambridge* concerning the author or æra of this confession, but may possibly receive some account of it from that company. In the mean time, permit me to assure you that it came from *Geneva*, and I have very good reason to believe that it was the production of *John Knox*, the reformer of *Scotland*. It is taken from the “service, discipline, and form of the common prayers and ad-
“ministration

“ ministration of the sacraments used in the *Eng-
lish* church of *Geneva*, as it was approved by
“ that most Reverend Divine Mr. *John Calvin*, and
“ the church of *Scotland* ^a.”

THE *English* Church at *Geneva* was founded about the year 1555. *Knox* was appointed minister thereof, and sent for from *Scotland* to take upon him the care of it. In 1556. he went over to that congregation, and being pressed by his friends in *Scotland* to return thither, he gave them this answer — “ that
“ he would visit them so soon as he might put order
“ to that dear flock, that was committed to his
“ charge.” From whence we may fairly infer that he had the principal hand in compiling the above form used in that church, where this confession appears. But whether he composed it or only adopted it from the *Geneva*, or other foreign forms, the church of *England*, and our reformers in either case, stand clear of it. I could have added much more in support of what is here advanced, did the limits of this letter allow of so long a digression.

THE patrons of the *Geneva* bible made use of all their power to get it established as the authorized translation, but they never could obtain any more than to have it printed here for the use of private families. *Cranmer*’s bible was always used

^a See this form of prayer re-published in the *Phoenix*, V. II. P. 204.

in churches till the Bishops' was printed in 1568; which superseded it; and *James* the Ist's succeeded that in 1611.

YOUR quotation from the catechism ascribed to Bishop *Ponet* may seem more to your purpose; that catechism being set forth by command of King *Edward VI.* But neither does that come up to your point. The free-agency of man is not there denied, nor universal redemption: nor is the indefectibility of the elect asserted. The catechism it is true, speaks in pretty high terms of election and predestination. But you would have given a more fair representation of the doctrine therein contained, had you not omitted the following passage which immediately precedes your quotation, viz. "To the church properly belong those who
 "truly fear, honour, and worship God, wholly applying their minds to live an holy and godly life,
 "and who, placing their only hope and confidence
 "in him, expect with certainty the blessing of
 "eternal life." After which follows—"As many
 "as are in this faith stedfast were chosen, predestinated &c." We see then that in this author's opinion, those only are elect and predestinated, who truly fear God and live a holy and godly life; the only fruits by which the good tree may be known^a.

^a The judicious reader is desired to consult *Heylin's* hist. quinq. artic. p. 2. chap. 15. at the beginning; where this quotation from Bishop *Ponet's* catechism is set in a clear and most

BUT who would have thought that we should be pressed with the authority of the synod of *Dort*? and be told that the abettors of the doctrines of free-will &c. were deprived and debarred by this synod FROM ALL OFFICES IN ANY UNIVERSITY? How do the decrees of this synod concern us? Were they ever received in *England*, or in this University? And what do you mean by saying that these errors were condemned by all the reformed churches? It was only a national synod, and it calls itself so: and its sentence against the remonstrants is directed only to all and singular the pastors &c. in *fœderato Belgio*, “in the United Provinces.” Its authority was never owned by the Lutheran churches, or here in *England*. Divines of other nations were indeed invited to this synod: but not many came. Our King *James* sent there not five Bishops and Doctors in Divinity, but only one Bishop, and three other Doctors in Divinity, and afterwards he sent Dr. *Balcanqual*, a *Scotchman*. If these entered the synod rigid Calvinists, they came from it much less so. If they signed the decrees of the synod, they did it with restrictions and limitations^a. They offered these three propositions as their sentiments, which they say were in like man-

satisfactory light. This history is an answer to *Prynne's* Anti-arminianism, in which may be found this and most of your other arguments.

a *Hale's* Golden Remains.

her approved by the foreign Divines. I. “a Deus
 “ lapsi humani generis miseratus, misit filium
 “ suum, qui seipsum dedit pretium redemptionis
 “ pro peccatis totius mundi.” II. “ In hoc me-
 “rito mortis Christi fundatur universale promissum
 “ evangelicum, juxta quod omnes in Christum
 “ credentes remissionem peccatorum & viam æter-
 “ nam reipsâ consequantur.” III. “ In ecclesia,
 “ uti juxta hoc promissum evangelicum salus om-
 “ nibus offertur, ea est administratio gratiæ suæ,
 “ quæ sufficit ad convincendum omnes impæni-
 “ tentes & incredulos, quod sua culpa voluntaria,
 “ vel neglectu, vel contemptu evangelii perierint,
 “ & beneficia oblata amiserint.”

THESE are opinions very different from yours, and plainly assert universal redemption and free-agency. It was indeed in a great measure owing to the heats and violence, with which matters were carried in that synod, and the great severity of the horrible decrees there framed, that our *English* Di-

a God having compassion on the sinful race of man, sent his own Son, who gave himself a ransom for the sins of the whole world. II. In this merit of Christ's death is founded the universal promise of the gospel; according to which all that believe in Christ may actually receive remission of sins, and life eternal. III. As according to this evangelical promise salvation is offered to all men, the administration of God's grace in the church is such, as is sufficient to convince all impenitent and incredulous men, that they have perished, and forfeited the benefits offered them, through their own voluntary fault, and through neglect or contempt of the gospel.

vines, who attended that synod, began to have less reverence for the doctrines of *Calvin*. Thus it fared with the learned Mr. *Hales*, who went thither a rigid Calvinist: “but there I bid *John Calvin* “good night,” said he to his friend Mr. *Farindon*^a. And Bishop *Hall*, one of these Divines, published afterwards a small piece entitled, *via media*, “the “way of peace in these five busy articles, commonly “known by the name of *Arminius*.” Here he endeavours to reconcile both parties by setting forth such propositions, as he thought both might agree in; and tells us that the Church of *England*, in her articles, goes a mid-way betwixt both. Among those propositions (though I cannot subscribe to all of them) there are these following; viz. “God “does neither actually damn, or appoint any soul “to damnation, without the consideration and “respect of sin.” “God pitying the woful condition of man, fallen by his free-will into sin “and perdition, sent his own Son that he should “give himself a ransom for the sins of the whole “world.” “In working upon the will God does “not overthrow the nature of the will, but causeth “it to work after its own native manner, freely and “willingly.” So much for the famous synod of *Dort*! ^b Concerning which, in answer to every thing

^a Mr. *Farindon*'s letter prefixed to his *Golden Remains*.

^b For a more particular account of this synod, the persons who composed it, and the methods made use of to carry their measures, I refer the reader to *Collier*'s history.

you have said, I shall content myself with the words of *Collier*. Vol. 2d. P. 718. “ The British
 “ Divines (in that synod) asserted an universality
 “ of redemption by the death of Christ, but this
 “ would by no means pass upon the majority. In
 “ short, the Arminian tenets were condemned, and
 “ the remonstrants required to subscribe to the cen-
 “ sure of their own doctrine; and upon their refusal
 “ of this condition about SEVEN HUNDRED families
 “ were banished by order of the States General.”

You had better have forborne to put us in mind of what passed in the succeeding reign, or to have made mention of THAT HONOURABLE House of Commons. I desire you to consider what faction it was, which then prevailed towards the overthrow of the Church. Was it not that of the Puritans? And were not the doctrines of Calvinism their leading principles? Did they not hold these very tenets of election, absolute predestination &c. which you so warmly espouse? These were the men who cried out, ^a The Church, The Church,—the Temple of the Lord are we; who called themselves “ the
 “ elect people of God,” “ his sheep,” “ his cho-
 “ sen,” his saints;” who fancied themselves act-
 ing under the influences of the spirit, and guided by his inspiration: and under this persuasion broke out into treason and rebellion, murdered the best of Kings, and overthrew our excellent constitution

^a P. 73.

both in church and state. The doctrines which you would father upon *Cranmer* and *Ridley* were really those of *Prynn*, *Hugh Peters*, *Marshall*, *Owen*, and others, who composed the assembly of Divines, “most of whom were (according to my Lord “*Clarendon*^a) declared and avowed enemies to the “doctrine and discipline of the Church of *England*; “some of them infamous in their lives and conver- “sations; and most of them of very mean parts in “learning, if not of scandalous ignorance, and of “no other reputation than of malice to the Church “of *England*.”

ZEAL for your beloved tenets has here hurried you on to an open discovery of those principles, which you had before endeavoured to disguise under specious professions of an “high veneration “for the doctrine and discipline of the Church of “*England*.” This honourable House of Commons, these men, who abolished episcopacy, voted down the liturgy, established the covenant, and overturned the government, were it seems, “firmly “and zealously attached to our ancient constitu- “tion in Church and State:” These men, who had by sedition and rebellion broken down the barriers of law and justice, and, by stripping the King of even the shadow of royalty, had paved the way for his murder, must not “be men- “tioned with those enthusiastic miscreants who

^a Hist. Reb. vol. 1. b. 5. p. 415.

“perpetrated

“perpetrated the most horrible deed that ever the sun beheld.” But, pray, what were the Principles of those enthusiastic miscreants? were they not the same with yours? Were not those men the saints of the earth? the elect of God? and did they not pretend to receive their commission from Jesus Christ? — In short, your defence of that honourable House, and the ^a authorities by which you support it, are equally worthy of the cause you are engaged in; but God grant this church and nation may never again experience the patriotism of such demagogues; who may indeed be entitled to the encomiums of a *Macauley*, or a —

WE come now to the articles of religion. With regard to them, I would observe in general that they were drawn up with great moderation; and those in particular which treat of these difficult points of free-will &c. were purposely worded in general terms, that persons, who were of different persuasions in several particulars relating to them, might yet agree in the general doctrines there delivered. They went (as Bishop *Hall* observes) a mid-way between both, guarding against the extremities on each side; on one hand condemning the Papists, who ascribed a merit to good works, and on the other the Antinomians, who denied the necessity of them. We have an instance of the like

^a Sir *Walter Earle*, to whose speech you refer, was one of the leaders in the rebellion. I need not acquaint the reader with the political or religious principles of Mrs. *Macauley*.

moderation

moderation in the 23d article, which teaches “ that
 “ it is not lawful for any man to take upon himself
 “ the office of public preaching or ministering the
 “ sacraments in the congregation, before he be law-
 “ fully called ; and that “ those we ought to judge
 “ lawfully called, which be chosen and called to
 “ this work, by men who have public authority
 “ given them in the congregation to call and send
 “ ministers into the Lord’s vineyard.” Who these
 are is not here determined. The compilers were
 not willing to condemn or unchurch the reformed
 churches abroad, where episcopacy was not establish-
 ed, and therefore prudently avoided determining
 the question, whether episcopal ordination is neces-
 sary. They who hold, and they who deny the
 necessity of episcopal ordination, may both subscribe
 to this article : those only are condemned by it,
 who hold that a man may preach without any law-
 ful vocation. The same moderation the compilers
 of our articles have observed in the points before
 us. The Protestant churches abroad were divided
 in these points : some held with *Luther*, and some
 with *Calvin*. *Cranmer* and *Ridley* therefore, and
 the other compilers of our articles, expressed them
 purposely in general terms, so as to include all
 moderate men on both sides, and condemn only the
 extremities on either.

BUT we are told that “ these articles were drawn
 “ up on purpose to prevent diversity of opinions, and

“therefore the compilers of them were particularly
 “careful to avoid the possibility of an ambiguous
 “expression.” The very same objections were some
 time ago made by Dr. *Clarke*, and have lately been
 renewed by the author of the Confessional, and have
 received a sufficient answer both from Dr. *Water-*
land and the Letter-writer^a. “The compilers
 “could only mean diversity of opinions about
 “points expressed and decided in the articles,
 “and not about others.”

THE same Letter-writer distinguishes between
 general propositions and ambiguous or equivocal
 ones; and so did Dr. *Waterland* before him^b. “It
 “is not fairly suggested (says that excellent writer)
 “that when men of different sentiments, as to par-
 “ticular explications, subscribe to the same ge-
 “neral words, that they subscribe in contradic-
 “tory, or even in different senses. Both sub-
 “scribe to the same general propositions, and
 “both in the same sense, only they differ in the
 “particulars relating to it: which is not differ-
 “ing, (at least it need not be) about the sense
 “of the article, but about particulars not con-
 “tained in the article.” His meaning may be
 illustrated by the following instance: We all sub-
 scribe to this proposition, viz. Subjects ought to
 be obedient to their lawful sovereign; though we

^a Letter 2d. p. 136.

^b Case of Arian subscription, p. 40.

may differ about the motives of that obedience, and the authority on which it is founded; some thinking it to be of divine right, others, that it is derived merely from the compact between King and people. What you add about the “^a King’s declaration prefixed to the articles” is also there fully answered. We say then that the articles are clear, as far as they go: but they leave many things relating to the points treated of undetermined. Thus the 23d article clearly condemns all who take upon them to preach, or administer the sacraments, without any outward ordination: but they leave it undetermined whether it be necessary that that ordination should be conferred by a Bishop. And thus also the articles before us clearly condemn the Papists, who hold the merit of good works; and the Pelagians, who deny the necessity of grace, and hold that original sin standeth only in the following of *Adam*; they condemn also those rigours of Calvinism, which you espouse. — But (as the above-cited Letter-writer observes) “all
 “intermediate opinions, how to reconcile God’s
 “prescience of a certainty of events with free-
 “agency, the unequal vouchsafements of the
 “means of grace, their sufficiency and efficacy,
 “the co-operations of grace and free-will &c. are
 “left undetermined. Betwixt the extremes which
 “are condemned (says the same writer) nice ques-
 “tions may exercise the subtleties of the schools,
 “which our articles meddle not with. Their pur-

“ pose is to recommend such a reconciliation of
 “ grace and free will, God’s decrees, and his ge-
 “ neral promises, as may teach us to avoid def-
 “ pair and unclean living, and influence us to fol-
 “ low in our doings that will of God expressly de-
 “ clared to us in the word of God.” But to de-
 scend to particulars :

First, OF FREE-WILL.

WE acknowledge with the article the great corruption and depravity of human nature, the necessity of grace, and the inability of man without the assistance of God’s grace to perform any good works. How injurious therefore is your insinuation “ that any of these men were expelled because
 “ they held the^a influences of the holy spirit necessary to constitute every one a child of God.” There was no such article of accusation, and God forbid that there ever should. You must be sensible that you have shamefully misrepresented this matter, and that they were accused not of holding the influences, but the extraordinary, and irresistible influences of the holy spirit. But to return — as God is ready to afford his grace to all who will concur with it, so ’tis left to man’s free choice, whether he will concur with it, or no. And therefore, if he perishes for want of this grace, ’tis entirely his own fault. Will you then say that the doctrine of man’s free-will to good or

evil was held in utter abhorrence by our reformers? The contrary has appeared by quotations from the *Pia et Catholica Institutio* — “^a Nec liberum arbitrium ita prædicent, ut gratiam Dei afficiant contumeliâ, nec gratiam sic efferant, ut libero arbitrio locum non relinquunt” — are their words. And one of the articles of religion in King *Edward* the Vth's time thus expresses it — “^b Gratia Christi voluntati violentiam nullam infert; et nemo hâc de causâ, cum peccaverit, seipsum excusare potest, quasi nolens aut coactus peccaverit.” St. *Austin* also, the great assertor of the necessity of grace against the Pelagians, asserts the freedom of man's will in several parts of his works. In his 47th epistle he exhorts Christians, “^c ut in fide catholicâ perseverent, quæ neque liberum arbitrium negat, siue in vitam malam, siue in bonam, neque tantum ei tribuit, ut sine gratiâ Dei valeat aliquid.” Nay, he has a whole book de gratiâ et libero arbitrio, written purposely to

a “ Let them not so extol free will, as to do despite to the grace of God, nor so magnify grace, as to leave no room for free will.

b “ The grace of Christ offers no violence to the will, and no one may on this account, when he has sinned, excuse himself, as if he had sinned involuntarily, and by compulsion.

c “ That they would persevere in the catholic faith, which neither denies free-will, whether to a good or bad life, nor attributes so much to it, as that it can have any efficacy without the grace of God.

confute

confute the error of those, “^a qui sic gratiam Dei defendunt, ut negent hominis liberum arbitrium, aut, quum gratia defenditur, negari existiment liberum arbitrium.” And he there proves the freedom of the will from many texts of scripture. And indeed, if men have no freedom of will, there can be neither virtue nor vice, reward nor punishment. To say that men are from their birth laid under a necessity of sinning, is to make God the author of sin. But I chuse to urge these arguments in the words of St. *Austin*. “^b Nunc verò usque adeò peccatum voluntarium est malum, ut nullo modo sic peccatum si non sit voluntarium, et hoc quidem ita manifestum est, ut nulla hinc doctorum paucitas, nulla indoctorum turba dissentiat c.” Again — “^d Peccatum fit ab animâ

^a “ Who so defend the grace of God as to deny the free-will of man, or think, that when the grace of God is asserted, free-will is denied.”

^b “ Now sin is so far a voluntary evil, that it can by no means be sin, if it be not voluntary; and this is indeed so evident, that neither the learned few, nor illiterate many have dissented from it.”

^c De vera relig. lib. 1. cap. 13.

^d “ Sin proceeds from a rational soul, which has freedom of will; and the justice of God inflicts a punishment, who does nothing unjustly. Against this doctrine the Manichees with their usual blindness object; and though they are convinced that nature is not evil, but that it is in the power of man to do well or ill, yet say that the will of the soul is not free, not seeing their own absurdity: For who does not cry out that it is absurd to give precepts to him who is not at liberty to do
“ what

“ rationali, cui liberum voluntatis arbitrium est :
 “ & poenam infligit iustitia Dei, qui nihil facit in-
 “ iuste. Adversus hæc solitâ cœcitate Manichæi
 “ latrant, et cum convincuntur naturam non esse
 “ malum, sed in potestate esse hominis facere benè
 “ aut malè, dicunt non esse animæ liberam volun-
 “ tatem, et non vident cœcitatem suam. Quis
 “ enim non clamet stultum esse præcepta dare ei,
 “ cui liberum non est quod præcipitur facere, &
 “ iniquum esse eum damnare, cui non fuit potestas
 “ iussâ complere ? Et has iniustitias & iniquitates
 “ miseri non intelligunt Deo se ascribere ^a. ” Nay,
 all the precepts and exhortations, the promises and
 threatnings in scripture suppose man to be a free
 agent. “ ^b I have set before you life and death,
 “ blessing and cursing, (said God to the *Jews*)
 “ chuse life, that both thou and thy seed may live.
 “ ^c Cast away from you all your transgressions
 “ whereby ye have transgressed, and make you a
 “ clean heart and a new spirit, for why will ye die,
 “ O house of *Israel* ? for I have no pleasure in the
 “ death of him that dieth, saith the Lord God :
 “ wherefore turn yourselves, and live ye. ” And
 with regard to the heathen nations before the
 coming of Christ, we are told, “ ^d that the Gen-

“ what is commanded, and that it is unjust to condemn him
 “ who had it not in his power to fulfil the command ? And the
 “ wretches do not perceive that they ascribe this injustice and
 “ iniquity to God.

^a De fide contra Manich. c. 10.

^b Deut. xxx. 19. ^c Ezek. xviii. 31, 32. Rom. ii. 14, 15.
tiles

“ tiles which had not the law, did by nature the
 “ things contained in the law ; and that the work
 “ of the law was written in their hearts, their con-
 “ science also bearing witness, and their thoughts
 “ the mean while accusing, or else excusing one
 “ another.” The ^a same scriptures which teach us
 that God worketh in us both to will and to do, out
 of his loving kindness ^b (as it should be translated)
 exhort us also to work out our own salvation ; ^c to
 give diligence, to make our calling and election
 sure : ^d to lay hold on eternal life : ^e to receive not
 the grace of God in vain ; and ^f to grieve not the
 holy spirit of God, whereby we are sealed unto the
 day of redemption.

BUT not to multiply instances — our Saviour
 asserts the freedom of man's will in that pathetic
 address to the city of *Jerusalem*. *Matt. xxiii, 37.*
 “ O *Jerusalem, Jerusalem*, thou that killest the
 “ prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto
 “ thee, how often WOULD I have gathered thy
 “ children together, even as a hen gathereth her
 “ chickens under her wings, and ye WOULD
 “ not.” I chuse to insert here the sentiments
 of the celebrated *Erasmus* on this passage of our
 Saviour, and its parallel one in *Luke 13, 34.* be-
 cause his excellent paraphrase on the gospels, you
 know, was translated, and by the injunctions of

a Phil. ii. 12, 13. b υπερ της ευδοκίας. c 2 Pet. i. 10.
 d 1 Tim. vi. 19. e 2 Cor. vi. 1, f Eph. iv. 30.

King *Edward VI.* and Queen *Elizabeth*, was ordered to be placed in churches for the instruction of the people. His authority then ought to have weight, as it had the sanction of our two princely leaders in the reformation. *Matt. xxiii. 57.* “^a *Hierusalem, Hierusalem*, whiche killest the prophets,
 “ and stonest to death them that be sent unto the,
 “ howe often have I travayled to gather thy chyl-
 “ dren together, lyke as the careful hen, fearyng
 “ her chickens, dothe cloke them together, and
 “ noryshe them under her wynges, and thou
 “ wouldest not. Nothing is let passe of my be-
 “ halfe, whereby thou mightest be saved, but con-
 “ trarywyse thou hast done what thou canst to
 “ bryng destruction to the, and to exclude salva-
 “ tion from the. But to whom free wyll is once
 “ gyven, he cannot be sated against hys wyll;
 “ Your wyll ought to be agreeable unto my wyll.”
 fol. LXXXV, Again *Luke xiii. 34.* after repeating
 the text, he adds, “ But thy stubbornnesse hath
 “ gon beyond my goodnes: and as though thou
 “ haddest even vowed and beheasted thy selfe to ut-
 “ tre ruine, so dooest thou refuse all thynges whereby
 “ thou mightest bee recovered and made whole^a.”

THE image, under which our Saviour describes his affectionate concern for this obstinate, ungrateful people, is one of the most beautiful and tender in nature, expressing the softest feelings, the quickest sensations of parental affection, compassion, anx-

iety, distress. The prophet *Isaiab* had long before represented the Almighty under an image not less expressive of his readiness to save them, and of their unwillingness to be saved; as “spreading out his hands all the day to a rebellious people.” To this passage of *Isaiab* St. *Paul* appeals in vindication of God’s justice in at length rejecting the *Jews* in their national capacity; assuring them at the same time that “there is no difference between the *Jew* and the *Greek* (as individuals) for the same Lord over all, is rich unto all that call upon him;” and putting them in mind, that they may have no excuse for their infidelity, of the powerful means of salvation, and the singular opportunities of believing, which had been vouchsafed unto them, in preference to the Gentiles — “But to *Israel* he saith, all day long I have stretched forth my hands unto a disobedient, and gainfaying¹ people.” Let me intreat you to consider well the force of these expressions, and then tell me whether it be not a mere mockery of God to represent him as all day long stretching forth his hands to the relief of those, who, he had before determined, should not be in a capacity of receiving it? or to what purpose was that pathetic address of our Lord to the city of *Jerusalem*, if he had not with the invitation also given them the power to find refuge under his wings^a?

^a See likewise the parable of the talents.

As to the next article of ELECTION and REPROBATION, I think the question may be decided by what has been said under the former articles; for if all men are to be judged according to their works, and if they have freedom of will either to do good or evil, there can be then no absolute and irrelative decrees, either of election, or reprobation. But here we are pressed with the authority of the 17th article. I answer in the words of the letter to the author of the Confessional^a. The contrary opinions charged on the 17th article, are not contained in it, but are consequences drawn by different men from different parts of it, which the article was not framed to maintain, but to avoid. The article asserts a predestination to life, or God's everlasting purpose, before the foundations of the world were laid, to deliver from curse and damnation those, whom he hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation; and together with the end to grant also the means, effectual calling, justification, adoption. But when it is inferred by the fatalist, that this decree is irrelative and absolute, without faith and obedience foreseen, it is a doctrine (whether true or false) superadded to the article. And again, says the same excellent writer^b, "that these articles are susceptible of a sense, that is what you call Arminianism, is certain, because the compilers meant to warn people against a

^a Letter 2d, p. 160.

^b Let. 3d, p. 96.

“ predestination, which was contrary to conditional
 “ promises, not to ascribe their damnation to God,
 “ but to their own fault, and so to accord grace and
 “ free-will, as not to maintain either to the denial
 “ of the other. This appears by a summary of
 “ doctrines published by them about eight years
 “ before the articles came out, and from the Re-
 “ formatio Legum drawn up in the same year.”
 To which it may be proper to add the following
 injunction ^a of *Edward VI.* 1547, as a clear ex-
 planation of the sense in which our first reformers
 understood the above article. “ Also because those
 “ persons, which be sick, and in peril of death,
 “ be often times put in despair, by the craft and
 “ subtilty of the devil; who is then most busy,
 “ and specially with them that lack the know-
 “ ledge, sure persuation, and stedfast belief, that
 “ they may be made partakers of the great and
 “ infallible mercy, which Almighty God, of his
 “ most bountiful goodnesse, and meer liberality,
 “ without our deserving, hath offered freely to all
 “ persons, that put their full trust and confidence
 “ in him: therefore that this damnable vice of
 “ despair may be clearly taken away, and firm
 “ belief, and stedfast hope surely conceived of all
 “ their parishioners, being in any danger, they shall
 “ learn, and have always in readinesse, such com-
 “ fortable places and sentences of scripture, as do
 “ set forth the mercy, benefits, and goodness of

^a See *Sparrow's* collection of canons, and the conclusion of
 the preface to *Queen Elizabeth's* homilies.

“ Almighty God towards all penitent and believing
 “ persons, that they may at all times (when neces-
 “ sity shall require) promptly comfort their flock,
 “ with the lively word of God, which is the only
 “ stay of man’s conscience.” Queen *Elizabeth’s*
 injunction 1559, is almost in the same words.

I would farther observe, that the article speaks of a predestination decreed by God’s counsel secret to us, and to be discerned only by the working of the spirit of Christ mortifying the works of the flesh; and directs us to receive God’s promises in such wise as they be generally set forth to us in the holy scripture: But there we shall find all these promises conditional. “^a If thou wilt enter into
 “ life keep the commandments (saith our Saviour.)
 “^b He that endureth to the end shall be saved.” His apostle exhorts us to give^c diligence to make our calling and election sure: for if we do these things we shall never fall; which plainly implies, that, unless we use our own diligence, our calling and election is not sure; and that, if we take not care to do these things, to add to our faith virtue &c. we MAY and SHALL fall.

You are pleased to give us several proofs of your notion of election, from the offices of the Church of *England*; I wish you had chosen to do it from scripture, which is our rule of faith, and by which

a Matt. xix. 17.

b Matt. x. 22. Mar. xiii. 13.

c 2 Pet. i. 10.

the doctrines of our Church must be ultimately tried; but you will find no proof there of any absolute election, without any respect to men's faith and obedience.

BUT since you appeal to our liturgy, which is appointed for the daily service of the Church, and may therefore be supposed to contain in its various offices the pure and genuine doctrines of the gospel, it will not be improper to examine it more minutely with respect to the doctrines of free-will, universal redemption, falling from grace &c.

THE sentences of scripture, with which the morning and evening prayer are appointed to begin, fully declare the free-will of man; his acceptance with God whenever he shall turn away from his wickedness; and God's faithfulness upon our confession and repentance to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.—The exhortation, confession, and absolution have an immediate reference to these sentences and are framed upon the doctrines herein contained. In the exhortation we are all entreated not to “dissemble nor cloak our
“sins, but to confess them with an humble, lowly,
“penitent, and obedient heart, to the end that we
“may obtain forgiveness of the same:” according to which exhortation, we proceed to confession.

IN the absolution the priest declares that “Almighty God desireth not the death of a sinner but

“ rather that he may turn from his wickedness and
 “ live,” and by divine authority pronounces that
 “ God pardoneth and absolveth all them that truly
 “ repent.”——What words can more fully express
 his gracious promises to all men if they will repent,
 or the power which he has given to all men by re-
 pentance and faith to lay hold of those promises? —
 In the Lord’s prayer we petition God not to lead us
 into temptation, which implies that all, the very
 best of men, are liable to fall into temptations and
 divers lusts, which may drown the soul in perdition.
 But how is this consistent with an absolute impossi-
 bility of falling from grace?—The hymn called *Te*
Deum thus celebrates the universal redemption by
 the incarnation and death of Christ, “ when thou
 “ tookest upon thee to deliver man thou didst not
 “ abhor the virgin’s womb; when thou didst over-
 “ come the sharpness of death, thou didst open the
 “ kingdom of heaven to all believers.——The suf-
 frages, offered up by the priest and all the congrega-
 tion alternately, are quite inconsistent with your no-
 tion of absolute predestination and indefectible assu-
 “ rance. Grant us thy salvation,—take not thy holy
 “ spirit from us.”—From the petition, “ make thy
 “ chosen people joyful,” you infer indeed your doc-
 trine of election; but the word chosen or elect in
 scripture ^a signifies all Christians in general, or

a 2 Tim. ii. 10. Col. iii. 12. Titus i. 1. 1 Pet. i. 2.
 2 John i. 1 Pet. v. 13. Rom. xi. 7. Ephes. i. 4.
 2 Thess. ii. 13.

such ^a Christians as walk worthy of the vocation by which they are called. Nor does it bear a different sense in our offices, — God has knit together his elect, *i. e.* all Christians in one communion and fellowship — God the Holy Ghost, who sanctifieth all the elect people of God, *i. e.* all Christians, or at least all good Christians, who are ready to comply with his motions. I wonder how you could quote this, and overlook the article immediately preceding it, which expressly asserts the universality of Christ's redemption, "I believe in God the Son, who hath redeemed me and all mankind." All those therefore whom God the Son hath redeemed, God the Holy Ghost sanctifies: but both only on condition of their own concurrence and compliance with the terms offered. Lastly, we beseech God shortly to accomplish the number of his elect, *i. e.* all those who shall finally persevere and depart in the true faith of his holy name, as the collect itself explains it.

THE word elect frequently occurs in the Roman breviary; the Papists make use of it in their rituals as well as we: I will only give you one instance of it; "^b Dulcissime domine Jesu Christe, per virtutem sanctissime passionis tuæ recipe me in numerum ELECTORUM tuorum." So that if the use of this word will prove the compilers of our liturgy

^a Matt. xxiv. 24, 31. Luke xviii. 7. Rom. viii. 33.

^b Modus juvandi morientes.

Predestinarians, it will prove the Church of *Rome* so too, and that in this respect it is as orthodox as Calvinism itself.

IN the litany we beseech God to strengthen such as do stand, and to raise up them that fall. In the office for *Asb-Wednesday* the exhortation fully declares the doctrine of free-will, and universal redemption, which I beg you to peruse with candor; and the prayer following the suffrages has these words: "O most mighty God and merciful Father, who hast compassion upon ALL MEN, and hatest NOTHING that thou hast made; who Wouldest NOT the death of a sinner, but that he should rather turn from his sin, and be saved &c. But to put the matter beyond all doubt, I refer you to the office of public baptism of infants: where the priest, after having read the gospel appointed for that occasion &c. thus addresses the sponsors, "Dearly beloved, ye have brought this child here to be baptized, ye have prayed that our Lord Jesus Christ would vouchsafe to receive him, to release him from his sins, to sanctify him with the Holy Ghost, to give him the kingdom of heaven and everlasting life: ye have heard also that our Lord Jesus Christ hath promised in his gospel to grant all these things that ye have prayed for; which promise he for his part will most surely keep and perform." And after having performed the office of baptism, he thus addresses the supreme being, "We yield thee hearty thanks, " most

“ most merciful Father, that it hath pleased thee
 “ to regenerate this infant with thy holy spirit,
 “ to receive him for thine own child by adoption,
 “ and to incorporate him into thy holy Church.”

FROM these passages I infer that it is the plain and undoubted doctrine of our Church that every person, who is by baptism admitted into the Christian covenant, is partaker of these high privileges, and becomes thereby, as our catechism sets forth, “ a member of Christ, the child of God, and an “ inheritor of the kingdom of heaven ;” that ALL Christians are by baptism admitted into a state of grace, and will most assuredly, if they perform their part, be entitled to the “ promises of God made to them in that sacrament.” With regard to infants the rubric declares, “ it is certain by God’s “ word that children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly “ saved :” with respect to those who come to age to take the promises of their sureties upon themselves, they have the same assurances on God’s part, if they will on their part perform what is promised for them, which, as the catechism declares “ they “ are bound to perform.” Where then is your doctrine of absolute, irrespective predestination, and reprobation? which would include children as well as adults, being as you represent it “ an absolute “ choice of some in preference of others, even before the children are born, or have done good “ or evil.” p. 55. Let me observe that our Church
 in

in this rubric professedly declares her tenets on these points, to which therefore any ambiguous expression, which may occur in her other offices, must be reconciled, unless you will suppose her to be inconsistent with herself.

THIS evidence of our Church is so clear and strong, that I perceive you cannot bear the light of it, and therefore endeavour to draw a veil over it; which however plainly discovers how painful it is to you.—To elude its force you are obliged to renounce your own tenets, and to deny what you had before asserted. Your words in *P. O.* are these — “ of all
“ others, the doctrines which deny fallen man’s free-
“ will to good, and which maintain an ABSOLUTE
“ CHOICE of some in preference to others, (even
“ before the children are born, or have done good
“ or evil &c.) are most hateful to the natural pride
“ of our hearts.” This is YOUR definition of pre-
destination; which, having no respect to sin, must
necessarily include infants as well as adults. And
yet in your REPLY you call this inference “ a most
“ unjust accusation, and tell me that you abhor
“ the doctrine of the damnation of infants, whether
“ baptized or unbaptized.” But as much as you
abhor it, it is a necessary consequence drawn from
your own definition. Can you assign any other
reason why ALL infants, whether baptized or
unbaptized, shall be saved, than, that the redemp-
tion purchased by Christ was universal, and ALL
who do not commit actual sin are made partaker
of

of it? if you cannot, it will necessarily follow, that actual sin is the only cause of reprobation. Here then I fix my foot, and entreat you to reconcile your doctrine of "AN ABSOLUTE CHOICE OF SOME
 " IN PREFERENCE TO OTHERS, EVEN BEFORE THE
 " CHILDREN ARE BORN, OR HAVE DONE GOOD
 " OR EVIL" either with YOUR OWN NOTIONS CONCERNING THE SALVATION OF ALL CHILDREN, OF the rubric of our Church. I beg you will be very explicit on this head; for here we join issue, and the whole controversy respecting the doctrines in question may be determined by it.

As to the doctrine of ABSOLUTE REPROBATION, it is no where taught in our articles, nor in the scriptures, but just the contrary. Our ^a articles say that "Christ came to take away the sins of the
 " world; and that ^b Christ hath made a perfect redemption and satisfaction for the sins of the
 " whole world." Our catechism teaches us that "the Son of God redeemed all mankind." Our communion-office expressly asserts "that Christ
 " hath made a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole
 " world." Our collects declare that "God hateth
 " nothing that he hath made, nor would the death
 " of a sinner, but rather that he should be converted
 " and live." This you seem sensible of, and therefore tell us "that "^c where we find any expressions

^a Art. 35.

^b Art. 31.

^c P. 55.

“ in our Church service, (and I suppose in scripture
 “ too) of Christ dying for all men &c. these mean
 “ that his sacrifice and undertaking were infinite and
 “ all sufficient : — but the application of this sacri-
 “ fice and undertaking is every where confined to
 “ the elect people of God, to his sheep, his chosen,
 “ his church, his seed, his spouse, his members.”

A miserable quibble this ! Suppose an act of grace to be set forth by a King, declaring his royal will, that all debtors in every prison throughout his dominions should be released on condition that they would present an humble petition to him by the hand of his Son, (who had discharged their several debts) and comply with other terms therein specified : but that secret orders had been previously given to prevent greatest part of those debtors from a possibility of presenting their petition, or performing the terms required. What would you think of the wisdom or mercy of such a King ? — Such is the character under which you represent the Majesty of heaven ; such you would persuade us are his dealings with the children of men. Had you said that the redemption was universal, but its application was confined to those only who would comply with the terms of the gospel-covenant, you had spoken the words of soberness and truth : But it is an insult on common sense to acknowledge that God hath given Christ to be a propitiation for the sins of the whole world, and at the same time pretend, * that the greatest part of the world, are without any fault

or neglect of their own, absolutely excluded from the benefit of it ; that they are appointed to damnation, reprobated by God himself unto death^a, and that it is not in their power to be saved. You tell us “^b you could bring proof upon proof of this doctrine :” and why did not you ? Those scripture appellations of the elect people of God &c. which you would appropriate to yourself and your sect, are applied in scripture to Christians in general. The elect and chosen of God are all good Christians ; ^c Christ’s sheep are they, who hear his voice and follow him, and abound in good works. ^d The CHURCH^e in scripture signifies the whole body of Christians, of which Christ is the head, ^f and we being many are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another.

THAT the doctrine of universal redemption is the doctrine of the Church of *England* has already appeared from her articles and offices. The same doctrine is also taught in her homilies. They teach “^g that Christ suffered death universally for all “men.” Again, “God so loved the world, saith “*St. John*, that he gave his only-begotten Son, “that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, “but have everlasting life.” But to whom did he give him ? He gave him to the whole world, that is to say, to *Adam* and all that should come after

a Art. *Lamb.* 1. & 9. P. 44, 45. b P. 55. c Joh.
x. 3, 4. d Matt. xxv. 32 &c. e Eph. v. 23 &c.
f Rom. xii. 5. g Second hom. on the passion.

him.

him. That this was also the doctrine of our first reformers, appears already from the citations produced from *Cranmer*, *Hooper*, and *Latimer*.

To these might be added the testimony of other foreign Protestants, and those of the primitive writers. “^a For the four first ages, says the learned “ *Bishop Bull*, no true member of the Catholic “ Church ever dreamt of that predestination, which “ some now make the very basis and foundation of “ Christianity. Those pious Christians, illustrious “ both in their life and death, lived and died in “ the firm persuasion of those truths, that Christ “ was the common Saviour of mankind, that no “ one to whom the gospel of Christ was made “ known could attain eternal happiness without “ obeying his commands; that no one could obey “ these commands without the grace and spirit of “ Christ; that the grace of God would not work “ out our salvation without the concurrence of our “ own industry: that this grace was wanting to no “ man; that he, who by the grace of God was in “ a state of salvation, might by his own fault fall “ from that state and perish eternally, and therefore “ he who standeth should take heed lest he fall.” But I rather choose to appeal to the testimony of scripture. And I could wish you had rather con-

^a *Bulli opera*, p. 682. In confirmation of this assertion *Bp Bull* has produced the testimony of several of the primitive FATHERS, *Irenæus*, *Origen*, *Cyprian*, *Basil* &c. to which I refer you. P. 648.

sulted your bible, than had recourse to certain questions and answers bound up with it. There you will find the doctrine of universal redemption taught in the plainest terms. There the gospel is called the ^a grace of God, which bringeth salvation to all men. Our Saviour himself declares ^b “ that God “ so loved the world, that whosoever believeth in “ him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” St. *Paul* teaches us, ^c “ that Christ Jesus gave himself a ransom for all; that ^d he died for all; ^e that “ as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all “ men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto “ justification of life; that he is the Saviour of all “ men, specially of those that believe.” And, addressing himself to the Athenians, he tells them — “ The times of ignorance God winked at; but now “ commandeth ALL MEN EVERY WHERE to repent,” and assigneth this reason for God’s universal command; “ because he hath appointed a day “ in which he will judge the world in righteousness.” *Acts* xvii. 30, 31. St. *John* says, “ Jesus “ Christ is the propitiation for our sins: and not “ for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole “ world.” Nay, he died for them that perish, “ ^h destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ

^a Εμφανη γαρ η χαρις τε Θεου η σωτηριος πασιν ανθρωποις.
Tit. ii. 11.

^b Joh. iii. 16.

^c 1 Tim. ii. 5, 6.

^d 2 Cor. v. 14.

^e Rom. v. 18.

^f 1 Tim. iv. 10.

^g Joh. ii. 1, 2.

^h Rom. xiv. 15.

“ died,”

“died,” saith the apostle. Again, “^a Through thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish, for whom Christ died?” Again, we are told, “^b that God would have all men to be saved; ^c that he is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance.” How dare you then confine the application of this redemption to the Elect only, *i. e.* to yourself and a few other babes of grace? Do you consider the dreadful consequences of this doctrine? a doctrine injurious both to God and man. That God should consign over the greatest part of mankind to everlasting destruction before they were born, without any respect to their good or evil works; that he should give them no power to perform any good work, and yet should damn them eternally for not doing what they were under an absolute impossibility of doing, is a doctrine, which it is impossible to reconcile to any notions, which we can form of God’s goodness, holiness, or justice. “These wretches do not understand that they ascribe these sins and iniquities to God” (says St. *Austin*). But to this you think it sufficient to answer, “^d O man, who art thou that repliest against God?” But St. *Paul* there speaks of those gifts of God, which he disperses arbitrarily, according to his good pleasure. He may impart the clear knowledge of his will to one nation and not to another, without any impeachment of his

^a 1 Cor. viii. 11.

^b 1 Tim. ii. 4.

^c 2 Pet. iii. 9.

^d P. 56. Rom. ix. 20.

justice.

justice. ^a But with regard to rewards and punishments, there is no respect of persons with God ; but he will render to every man according to his deeds. But you are pleased to object against “ making the “ Almighty spirit dependent on the will of the fallen “ creature.” p. 73. And do not you see that you compliment the omnipotence and sovereignty of God at the expence of his justice, holiness and goodness ? Must not the sentence of a righteous judge depend on the behaviour of those over whom he exercises judgment ? And if God will judge the world in righteousness, must not his decrees with regard to this judgment, in this respect, depend on the actions of his creatures, and the use they have made of their free-will ?

TELL me, if you can, how God can lay any man under a necessity of sinning consistently with his goodness ; or how he can sentence a man lying under that necessity to eternal damnation consistently with his justice and righteousness. I charge not you, sir, but I must charge your doctrine, in its necessary consequences, with the most glaring absurdity and gross impiety against God ; I wish too you would consider how uncharitable your notions are with regard to mankind. Pray, who are these sheep, these elect people of God, to whom you and your associates would confine the benefits of Christ's redemption ? — Yourself only — all the rest of mankind

^a Rom. ii. 6 &c. See answer to the Confessional, letter iii. p. 82.

you most charitably consign over to eternal damnation. The heathen world, I suppose, are not to be reckoned among the elect people of God, nor belong to his Church : all Heretics and Papists are excluded, for they are limbs of anti-christ, hold doctrines of devils, and shall be damned with unquenchable fire : and all Protestants too, who have adopted this heresy of universal redemption, and hold these doctrines of devils, these Popish ^a doctrines of free-will, conditional salvation &c. fall under the same censure, and are also ^b to BE DAMNED WITH UNQUENCHABLE FIRE. They only

^a You pretend, . . 7 3, to be much alarmed at the great increase of Popery in our land, and insinuate that we, by holding the doctrine of free-will and universal redemption, are the most strenuous abettors of it, “ declaring that there is less danger to be “ apprehended from private mass-houses than from public authorized chairs of oratory.” But let me tell you, that the only quarter from whence any real danger may be apprehended is that, from whence divisions are caused, and schisms made in the Church. The great door to Popery has been opened by the presumption of ignorant and foolish men, who pretend to be teachers, and fill their hearers with spiritual pride, and a contempt of their lawful pastors—who draw them from, what you call, the public authorized chairs of oratory, into private societies, and illicit conventicles, and teach them to neglect the service, and despise the ordinances of the Church. It has been the constant business of Papists to sow divisions among us, from whence they have reaped a plentiful harvest, to the increase of which you and your friends have greatly contributed. Knowing how much their cause is promoted by your performance, the Popish priests have been very industrious in dispersing and recommending it.

^b P. 54.

who

who are predestinated, who feel in themselves the motions of spiritual life, and an assurance of their own salvation, are the chosen flock; all others are excluded, all the good people of *England*, except the Methodists, Moravians &c. all the University of *Oxford*, except the pious congregation of Mrs. *Durbridge*. Thus you confine that grace of God, which bringeth salvation to all men, to yourselves alone, and damn all others who are not of your sect and party: and herein you are more uncharitable than the Papists themselves; they admit all of their communion, which takes in a large body of Christians. You exclude even your fellow Protestants, all but those, who in these abstruse and difficult points hold the same tenets with yourselves.

AND herein you fully verify the observations of the learned Bishop *Sherlock*, whose description of your tenets is so just, and so much to the purpose, that I cannot better close this article than in his words. “^a Whoever, says that great man, “ will examine into the bottom of men’s thoughts “ upon this subject, will find that the conclusion “ they make is commonly influenced by the consideration of their own circumstances. Every “ man in this case takes care of himself, and leaves “ the way open to his own salvation, how strongly “ soever he bars it against others. The great ad-

^a Discourse V. Vol. 2d.

“ vocates of election and reprobation always reckon
 “ themselves in the number of the elect; and,
 “ that their iniquities, of which they are often
 “ conscious, may not rise up against them, they
 “ maintain that the act of man cannot make void
 “ the purpose of God, or the sins of the elect de-
 “ prive them of the benefit of God’s eternal de-
 “ cree. Thus secured, they despise the virtues
 “ and moral attainments of all men, and doom
 “ them with all their virtues to destruction; whilst
 “ they advance themselves with all their sins to
 “ a throne of glory, prepared for them before
 “ the world began.

YOUR doctrine of PERSEVERANCE is nearly al-
 lied to the two former, If man has no free-will,
 but is absolutely predestinated to eternal salvation,
 then we must acknowledge that he cannot fall
 from grace. On the other hand, if we may fall
 from grace, there can be no absolute decree of
 election. And here you and your disciples hold,
 that he who is once a child of God is always a
 child of God, and that God never casts off those
 whom he hath once received. But herein you
 contradict the articles of the Church of *England*, to
 which you have subscribed, and therefore are sub-
 ject to the same censures you so liberally bestow on
 us. The 16th article teaches that, after we have
 received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from
 grace given, and fall into sin; and that deadly sin
 is here meant, appears from the beginning of the
 article.

article. It follows that by the grace of God we may rise again, which plainly implies that we also may not rise again.

You contradict our homilies. Among the homilies published in King *Edward* the VIth's time, there is one concerning the danger of falling from God. It speaks of those who truly believe the gospel; "be transformed to the image of Christ; be made partakers of the heavenly light, and of the holy spirit; and be fashioned to him in all good-ness requisite to the children of God;" and says that "if they after neglect the same, if they be unthankful unto him; if they order not their lives according to his example and doctrine &c. he will take away from them his kingdom &c. and if they remain disobedient to his word and will, they shall never enter into his rest, which is the kingdom of heaven."

In the second homily on the same subject we are told, "that if we, who are the chosen vineyard of God, bring not forth good grapes, that is to say, good works,—he will let us lie waste, will give us over; he will turn away from us, he will dig and delve no more about us—he will suffer us to bring forth brambles, bryars and thorns; all naughtiness, all vice; and that so abundantly, that they shall clean overthrow us, choke, strangle, and utterly destroy us;" and applying this parable, the homily adds, "Let us beware there-

“ fore, good christian people, lest that we reject-
 “ ing or casting away God’s word, be at length
 “ cast off so far, that we become as the children
 “ of unbelief, in a damnable state.”

THE same doctrine is taught in the second book
 of homilies published in Queen *Elizabeth’s* time.
 “ ^a These things well considered, let us now in the
 “ rest of our life declare our faith that we have in
 “ this most fruitful article, by framing ourselves
 “ thereunto, in rising daily from sin to righteous-
 “ ness, and holiness of life : for what shall it avail
 “ us (saith *St. Peter*) to be escaped and delivered
 “ from the filthiness of the world, through the
 “ knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ,
 “ if we be entangled again therewith, and be over-
 “ come again ? Certainly it had been better, (saith
 “ he) never to have known the way of righteous-
 “ ness, than after it is known, to turn back again
 “ from the holy commandment of God given unto
 “ us—What a shame were it for us, being so clearly
 “ and freely washed from our sins, to return to
 “ the filthiness thereof again : What a folly were
 “ it, thus endowed with righteousness, to lose it
 “ again ? What a madness were it to lose the in-
 “ heritance that we be now set in, for the vile and
 “ transitory pleasure of sin ? And what an unkind-
 “ ness should it be, where our Saviour Christ is
 “ come to us, to dwell with us as our guest, to

^a Sermon on the resurrection, p. 193.

“ drive

“ drive him from us, to banish him violently out
 “ of our souls, and instead of him, in whom is all
 “ grace and virtue, to receive the ungracious spi-
 “ rit of the devil ?” &c.

YOU differ from our first reformers, as appears from the quotations already produced from *Pia et Catholica Institutio—Reformatio Legum* — Bishop *Hooper* and *Latimer*. — They held that we might fall from grace, and a state of righteousness; “ that those who were written in the book of life
 “ might again be blotted out of it.” You differ from the first reformers in *Germany*, and from their confessions, on the plan of which our own articles were first formed. ^a The confession of *Augsburg*, the first summary of Protestant faith, condemns the Anabaptists, who denied that those who were once justified could lose the Holy Ghost. ^b The *Saxonick* confession compiled by *Melancthon* 1551, with design to offer it to the council of *Trent*, in the name of all the Protestants, and unanimously approved by the *German* divines, says — “ ex simi-
 “ libus dictis manifestum est aliquos renatos con-
 “ tristare et excutere spiritum sanctum, et rursus
 “ abjici a Deo, ac fieri reos iræ Dei, et æterna-
 “ rum pænarum.”

BUT, what is still worse, you contradict the holy scriptures. The prophet *Ezekiel* ^c puts the

^a Art. 12.

^b *Sleidan's Hist. Ref.* b. xxii. p. 510.

^c Ezek. xxxiii. 13. xviii. 24. See Dr. *Randolph's* sermon on Rom. viii. 16.

very case of a man in a state of salvation, in God's favour, who afterwards turns from his righteousness, and finally perishes—"when I shall say to the
 "righteous that he shall surely live, if he trust to
 "his own righteousness, and commit iniquity, all
 "his righteousness shall not be remembered, but for
 "his iniquity that he hath committed, he shall die
 "for it." In the scriptures of the New Testament we are exhorted ^ato work out our own salvation with fear and trembling; ^bto give diligence to make our calling and election sure; ^cnot to be high-minded, but fear, lest we also be cut off; ^dhe that thinketh he standeth is admonished to take heed, lest he fall. We read of some ^ewho were once enlightened and had tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and had tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, who have afterwards fallen away, and that so totally and finally, that it was impossible to renew them again unto repentance. And of others we ^fread, who had escaped the pollution of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, who have been again entangled therein, and overcome, whose latter end was worse than the beginning. The great Apostle St. *Paul* speaks with great diffidence and doubt of his own salvation—^g"Brethren, says he, "I count not myself to have apprehended, but this

^a Phil. ii. 12.

^b 2 Pet. i. 10.

^c Rom. xi. 20, &c.

^d 1 Cor. x. 12.

^e Heb. vi. 4, &c.

^f 2 Pet. ii. 20.

^g Phil. iii. 13, 10.

“ one thing I do, forgetting those things which are
 “ behind, and reaching forth unto those things
 “ which are before, I press toward the mark for the
 “ prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.”
 And again in another ^a place, “ I keep under my
 “ body and bring it into subjection, lest that by
 “ any means, when I have preached to others, I
 “ myself should be a cast-away or ^b reprobate.”

BISHOP *Sherlock* in his discourse on the text,
 “ Work out your own salvation with fear and
 “ trembling” (Disc. IV. Vol. 2d.) having reconciled the doctrine of God’s grace with the necessity of our own endeavours, and pointed out the several kinds of false or slavish fear, proceeds thus to the description of the true christian fear. “ Now then
 “ we are come to that which is indeed the good
 “ Christian’s fear, his constant fear ; and that is,
 “ the fear of himself : let him that standeth, says
 “ the Apostle, take heed lest he fall. There is
 “ no man so perfect but that he ought to carry
 “ this fear about him ; and where his fear points,
 “ there must his care and diligence be applied,
 “ that is, to himself still : he must watch his pas-
 “ sions and affections, lest any of them break
 “ out into open enmity against God ; his rebel
 “ heart must be guarded, lest it quench the holy
 “ flame, which God has kindled in it, lest it do
 “ despight to the spirit of God, which comes to
 “ dwell and inhabit in it.” And a little after,

^a 1 Cor. ix. 27.

^b ἀδόκιμος.

where

where he considers the consequences of the Apostle's doctrine and exhortation in the text, he proceeds thus — " It is evident that the christian
 " state is not a state of security ; for security is
 " inconsistent with any kind of fear and trem-
 " bling, and is indeed a condition that does not
 " call even for care and diligence. In a state of
 " security a man cannot even fear for himself ; for
 " to be sure of salvation, he must be sure of every
 " thing necessary to it ; and therefore he must
 " either be sure that he is to have no part him-
 " self in working out his salvation ; or, if he is to
 " have any, he must be sure and certain that he
 " shall perform it : either of which excludes all
 " manner of fear and trembling. Much less can
 " he, who is sure of being saved, fear being pu-
 " nished : So that there is no kind of fear left for
 " him ; and the Apostle's exhortation will have no
 " meaning in it to such a man. Work out your
 " salvation with fear and trembling : With fear of
 " what ? since nothing is left to be afraid of. And
 " yet to be sure of your salvation has been made
 " by some a necessary sign of regeneration and
 " adoption : and hence has proceeded the doctrine,
 " that grace once received can never be lost : and
 " if so, those who have received grace, can have
 " no reason to fear and tremble. And yet it can-
 " not be denied that the Philippians, to whom the
 " Apostle writes, had received grace ; since from
 " his own testimony we learn, that they had
 " obeyed always ; that in his bonds, and in the
 doctrine

“ doctrine and confirmation of the gospel, they
 “ had been partakers of his grace. Grace then
 “ they had received; what then had they to fear?
 “ if grace once received cannot be lost, that is, if
 “ grace gives security of salvation. To make
 “ then the Apostle consistent with himself, we
 “ must affirm, that it is his doctrine that grace
 “ may be lost; and that even those, who have
 “ made great progress in gospel obedience, are
 “ not secure of their state; but must labour on,
 “ and work on with fear and trembling, lest they
 “ come short of the promises they have received.”

As to the doctrine of JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH,
 let us see wherein we differ. First then we all
 hold that we are justified freely by God's grace,
 that there is no merit in good works, that we are
 not to place our redemption, or rest our plea on
 any works that we have done or can do, but only
 on the mercy of God, and the merits of our Re-
 deemer. And on the other hand I should hope
 that all, who believe the gospel, would agree that
 good works are the necessary condition both of
 our justification and salvation. Whether we con-
 sider the first justification of persons received into
 the Christian church, — the scripture teaches us
 that repentance, which consists in ceasing to do
 evil, and learning to do well, is necessary as pre-
 vious to this justification. *John the Baptist* a pre-
 pared the way of the Lord by preaching the bap-

Luke iii. 3.

tism

tism of repentance for remission of sins. — The first doctrine which our Saviour himself preached was — “^a Repent ye, and believe the gospel.” And with the same doctrine his Apostles opened their commission — “^b Repent and be baptized “every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, “for the remission of sins.” — Or if we ask what is the condition of our final justification at the day of judgment, both Christ and his Apostles will inform us ^c that God will then render to every man according to his works. What do you mean then by censuring those “^d who look to a righteousness “of their own, made up of terms, qualifications, “conditions, and such like trumpery, for acceptance “before God?” and asserting “^e that works are no “parts or conditions of our justification?” Parts or conditions — Are these synonymous terms? Pray, sir, what do you understand by parts? We hold, as well as you, that justification is the act of God alone, conferred on us freely by his grace; — that our own good works have no proper efficiency in the act of our justification; have no worth or merit in them; — that ^f we have all sinned, and come short of the glory of God, and can be justified and saved only by faith, by a reliance on the mercies and merits of Christ. But that good works, though imperfect and worthless, are yet required by God, as necessary terms, qualifications and conditions, both of our justification and salvation, and that we can-

^a Mark i. 15.

^b Acts ii. 38.

^c Mat. xvi. 27.

Rom. ii. 6.

^d P. 61.

^e Ibid.

^f Rom. iii. 23.

not

not be justified and saved without them, you cannot deny, without denying all the scriptures from one end to the other; and contradicting the very homilies, to which you appeal. "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments," saith our Saviour ^a. "Without holiness no man shall see the Lord," saith the Apostle ^b. After having quoted the homily, you tell us with an air of triumph — "Here is no mention of works either as conditions or as parts of justification, which, as plain as words can make it, is attributed ONLY to faith." I should wonder indeed if there were any mention of works, after the pains you have taken to suppress it, and when by your unfair method of quotation you have forced it to speak only your own language. But had you proceeded only one sentence further, you would have found the homily not so silent on that head as you would willingly represent it to be; for it immediately follows, "And yet that faith doth not exclude repentance, hope, love, dread, and the fear of God to be joined with true faith in every man that is justified, but it excludeth them from the office of justifying: so that although they be all present together in him that is justified, yet they justify not altogether. Nor doth that faith also exclude the justice of our good works necessarily to be done afterwards of duty towards God, (for we

^a Matt. xix. 17. ^b Heb. xii. 14. See *Bull's* op. p. 509, 655 &c. ^c P. 59. ^d Homily of salvation, part i. c. I.

“ are most bounden to serve God in doing good
 “ deeds commanded by him in holy scripture, all
 “ the days of our life) but it excludeth them, so
 “ that we may not do them to the intent to be
 “ made good by the doing of them.”

NOR is your other extract less partial, where
 you have omitted the words immediately following
 it for very obvious reasons, because they explain
 the sense in which the Greek and Latin Fathers
 hold justification by faith only. “^a Nevertheless
 “ (says the homily) this sentence, “ that we be jus-
 “ tified by faith only,” is not so meant by them
 “ (the fathers) that the said justifying faith is
 “ ALONE in man, without true repentance, hope,
 “ charity, dread and the fear of God at any time
 “ and occasion ; for when they say we be justified
 “ freely, they mean not that we should or might
 “ afterwards be idle, and that nothing should be
 “ required on our part afterwards ; neither mean
 “ they so to be justified without our good works,
 “ that we should do no good works at all, as shall
 “ be more expressed at large hereafter : But this
 “ proposition, that we be justified by faith only,
 “ freely and without good works, is spoken for to
 “ take away clearly all merit of our works, as be-
 “ ing insufficient to deserve our justification at God’s
 “ hands, and thereby most plainly to express the

^a Homily of salvation, part ii. c. 3. See likewise St. *Paul’s*
 doctrine of justification by faith most admirably explained in the
 Institution of a Christian man, in the chapter on faith, p. 1, 2.
 “ weak-

“weakness of man, and the goodness of God; the
 “imperfection of our own works, and the most
 “abundant grace of our Saviour Christ.”

AGAIN, in the declaration of the true, lively,
 and Christian faith, the homily thus expresses itself.
 “He that believeth all that is spoken of God in the
 “bible is true, and yet liveth so ungodly, that he
 “cannot look to enjoy the promises and benefits of
 “God; although it may be said, that such a man
 “hath a faith and belief to the words of God, yet
 “it is not properly said that he believeth in God,
 “or hath such a faith and trust in God, whereby he
 “may surely look for grace, mercy, and everlasting
 “life at God’s hand, but rather for indignation and
 “punishment, according to the merits of his wick-
 “ed life:” and the 3d sermon concludes with this
 exhortation — “Let us therefore (good Christian
 “people) try and examine our faith, what it is: let
 “us not flatter ourselves, but look upon our works,
 “and so judge of our faith what it is. Christ him-
 “self speaketh of this matter, and saith, the tree is
 “known by the fruit: therefore let us do good
 “works, and thereby declare our faith to be the lively
 “christian faith. Let us by such virtues, as ought to
 “spring out of faith, shew our election to be sure and
 “stable, as *St. Peter* teacheth; endeavour yourselves
 “to make your calling and election certain by good
 “works. And also he saith, minister or declare in
 “your faith virtue, in virtue knowledge, in know-
 “ledge temperance, in temperance patience, in pa-
 “tience

"tience godliness, in godliness brotherly charity, in
 "brotherly charity love : so shall we shew indeed
 "that we have the very lively Christian faith, and
 "may so both certify our conscience the better that
 "we be in the right faith, and also by these means
 "confirm other men. If these fruits do not follow,
 "we do but mock with God, deceive ourselves, and
 "also other men. Well may we bear the name of
 "Christian men, but we do lack the true faith that
 "doth belong thereunto ; for the true faith doth ever
 "bring forth good works, as *St. James* faith ; shew
 "me thy faith by thy deeds. Thy deeds and works
 "must be an open testimonial of thy faith ; other-
 "wise thy faith (being without good works) is but
 "the devil's faith, the faith of the wicked, a phan-
 "tasy of faith, and not a true Christian faith. And
 "like as the devils and evil people be nothing the
 "better for their counterfeit faith, but it is unto
 "them the more cause of damnation ; so they that
 "be Christians, and have received knowledge of
 "God and of Christ's merits, and yet of a set pur-
 "pose do live idly, without good works, thinking
 "the name of a naked faith to be either sufficient
 "for them ; or else setting their minds upon vain
 "pleasures of this world, do live in sin without re-
 "pentance, not uttering the fruits that do belong
 "to such an high profession, upon such presump-
 "tuous persons and wilful finners must needs re-
 "main the great vengeance of God, and eternal
 "punishment in Hell prepared for the unjust and
 "wicked livers." These, sir, are the words of our
 church,

church, which joins faith and good works together, making them both necessary conditions of our salvation, following herein the authority and example of *St. Peter*, who declares (*Acts* x. 34, 35.) “That
 “God is no respecter of persons; but in every
 “nation he that feareth him, and worketh right-
 “eousness is accepted of him.” Which declaration is a short, but full confutation of all your tenets.

THE judicious HOOKER speaks the same language — “Actual righteousness, says he, which is
 “the righteousness of good works succeedeth all,
 “followeth after all, both in order and time: which
 “being attentively marked, sheweth plainly how
 “the faith of true believers cannot be divorced from
 “hope and love; how faith is a part of sanctifica-
 “tion, and yet unto justification necessary; how
 “faith is perfected by good works, and not works
 “of ours without faith; and finally, how our fa-
 “thers might hold that we are justified by faith
 “alone, and yet hold truly that without works we
 “are not justified.” This likewise is the doctrine both of *St. Paul* and *St. James*. But for a fuller discussion of this matter, I beg leave to refer you to that excellent treatise of *Bishop Bull*, entitled, *Harmonia Apostolica*. In the conclusion of that work, the learned and pious author warns us to beware of four errors in this article of justification. First, that of the Papists, who ascribe a merit to good works. Secondly, that of the Antinomians,

a Discourse on justification, Sect. 21.

L

who

who deny the necessity of good works. Thirdly, that of the Pelagians, who deny the necessity of grace. Fourthly, that of the Manicheans, who deny all free-will.

I SHALL close the whole with the evidence of Bishop *Hopkins*, which possibly may have some weight with you, as you have enlisted him under your banner. His sentiments ON FREE-WILL are expressed in the following words—— “ If the devil
 “ could force men, he would likewise justify them,
 “ for that can be no sin, where there is no liberty :
 “ the same temptation which compels to any ac-
 “ tion, would likewise make that action to be no
 “ transgression, because laws are not given but upon
 “ supposition of freedom ; and therefore whosoever
 “ sins upon a temptation, sins not merely because
 “ he was tempted, but because he would sin ; and
 “ though the sin had not been committed without
 “ the temptation, yet the devil can be no farther
 “ chargeable than only because his malice prompts
 “ him to persuade us : our own wills are the most
 “ dangerous devils, freely embracing the proffers of
 “ Satan, and consenting to our own destruction,
 “ and whilst we consent to that upon which God
 “ hath threatened and entailed it : and therefore
 “ when thou sinnest, think not to lay the fault upon
 “ Satan, or his evil instruments, whom he makes
 “ use of in tempting ; for though it be their fault
 “ and guilt to tempt, yet it is only thine to yield ;
 “ and

“ and God will not condemn thee for being tempted,
 “ which thou couldest not help, but for yielding
 “ and consenting, which is thine own free act, and
 “ thine own sin also ; thou, who art drawn away
 “ by thy lewd companions to abuse thyself, and
 “ dishonour thy body by riot and luxury, or to
 “ break God’s laws and man’s by theft, or any
 “ other condemned crimes, though thou hast a
 “ great deal of reason to hate them, yet hast thou
 “ infinitely more reason to hate and abhor thyself ;
 “ they can but persuade, they cannot compel thee ;
 “ yea, if they should threaten thee with death it-
 “ self, unless thou consentest, yet thou liest under
 “ no force, but sinnest freely, and upon very weak
 “ motives dost destroy and damn thy own soul,
 “ since all motives inducing to sin must be account-
 “ ed weak, when God hath overbalanced them with
 “ the promise of everlasting life, and the threaten-
 “ ing of everlasting death : and therefore we find
 “ God as justly as frequently in scripture charging
 “ men’s perdition upon themselves, and laying the
 “ blood of their souls upon the stubborn resolved-
 “ ness of their own wills, *Hosea* 13. 9. O Israel
 “ thou hast destroyed thyself. *John* 5. 40. Ye will
 “ not come unto me that you may have life. *Matt.*
 “ 23. 37. O *Jerusalem, Jerusalem*, how often would
 “ I have gathered you, as a hen gathereth her
 “ chickens under her wings, and you would not !
 “ and therefore let your temptations be what they
 “ will, yet the sin and guilt is still your own, if, as

“you are led into temptations, so temptations lead
“you into sin.”

HIS doctrine of good works is delivered in words, worthy of your serious consideration and application. In his sermon on *John* 7. 19. — Did not *Moses* give you the law, and none of you keepeth the law? — he thus expresses himself, “I hope
“that what has been spoken of them (the commandments) has not been as water spilt upon the
“ground, or a sound only scattered and lost in the
“air; for these things are of infinite concernment
“to us: the knowledge and practice of them is as
“much worth as heaven and eternal life. And I
“may say unto you, as *Moses* to the *Israelites*, I
“have set life and death before you: life if you
“will hearken and obey, but eternal death and destruction if ye refuse and rebel. Entertain not any
“low and debasing thoughts of the law: think not
“the preaching of it unworthy the freedom of gospel times, or of gospel spirits: I know that a
“company of flush notionists, who are very willing to shake off the yoke from their necks, and to
“deliver themselves rather from the conscience,
“than from the power of sin, have clamoured
“against this way of pressing duty, and enforcing
“the authority of the law, as **LEGAL PREACHING**;
“and have blasphemed it, as contrary to that liberty which Christ has purchased for us; and
“much beneath the spiritual attainments of those

a *Hopkins* on the Lord's Prayer.

“that

" that are made perfect in him. And I fear lest
 " some of that corrupt leaven may still remain in
 " the spirits of too many who delight only to hear
 " of the riches of free grace, the priviledges of
 " saints, the all-sufficiency and willingness of Christ
 " to save them, and can melt themselves away in
 " the very sweetness and tenderness of their souls
 " under such glorious discoveries. But if obedience
 " and good works be pressed ; if we preach to them
 " concerning righteousness, temperance and justice,
 " and those moral duties of the law, which respect
 " our deportment towards men, as well as those
 " which respect the worship and service of God, this
 " is flat and insipid to these nice refined professors,
 " and they are ready with a scornful pity to censure
 " it for honest, moral, doctrine, fit only for young
 " beginners, who are not as yet come from under
 " a legal dispensation. — Beware, my brethren,
 " that you do not thus vilify and disparage the holy
 " law of God. For let me tell you, this is the rule
 " that he hath given us to guide our actions, and
 " this is the law by which he himself will judge
 " them : there is no other way to obtain salvation
 " but only through obedience to it. This law is
 " the very gate of heaven, and the two tables are
 " the two leaves of it. We shall never enter into
 " it but only through these, *Rev.* 22. 14. blessed
 " are they that do his commandment that they may
 " have right unto the tree of life, and may enter in
 " through the gates into the city. Although our
 " salvation be the purchase of Christ, and he alone

" hath redeemed us from death, and procured for
 " us glory and immortality by his own most pre-
 " cious blood, yet here the scripture affirms, that
 " we obtain a right unto the tree of life; *i. e.* to
 " everlasting life, by our obedience, and doing the
 " commands of God. A right, not indeed of me-
 " rit, but a right of evidence; our obedience to
 " the law is the only sound evidence that we can
 " have for our right to the promises of the gospel;
 " and without an universal obedience in the whole
 " course of our lives, all our joys and comforts and
 " confident expectations of heaven and happiness
 " are but splendid delusions, and enthusiastical
 " dreams, by which men of loose principles and
 " practices seek to unite together two things which
 " God hath put at an irreconcilable distance; that
 " is to say, an unholy life here, and an happy life
 " hereafter. And if to press this great truth upon
 " the conscience, and to insist on the necessity of
 " new obedience, and repentance from dead works,
 " as well as faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, be legal
 " preaching, let mine be ever so accounted. But
 " indeed this is so far from being a legal doctrine,
 " that it is one of the greatest and most precious
 " truths that the gospel exhibits. To preach of
 " justification by the law as a covenant is legal, and
 " makes void the death and merits of Jesus Christ.
 " But to preach obedience to the law as a rule is
 " evangelical; and it favours as much of a new-
 " testament spirit (as they phrase it) to urge the
 " com-

“ commands of the law, as to display the promises
“ of the gospel.”

I HAVE now gone through the several points of doctrine, which you have with greater confidence than truth pronounced to be the ^a very fundamental avowed doctrines of the Church of *England*; but which may now possibly appear in a different light even to you, or at least to others, who might have been deceived by the false glosses by which you disguised them.

INDEED you are sometimes obliged, in spite of your principles, to speak the language of common sense, when your cause requires it. When you inveigh with great indecency of expression against “ those subtle serpents ^b who lurk within the bosom
“ of the Church only to prey upon her vitals, and
“ who for the sake of filthy lucre carry on a solemn
“ farce of subscribing to articles, which many of
“ the subscribers no more believe than they do
“ mother *Goose*’s tales” &c. You tell us “ ^c that
“ this impious jesuitical equivocation, WITHOUT
“ SPEEDY REPENTANCE, MUST DRAW DOWN THE
“ VENGEANCE OF A LONG-SUFFERING GOD UPON
“ OUR LAND.” These words, if they have any meaning, imply that even these subtle serpents, who prey upon the vitals of the Church; who would overthrow her very foundation; who are guilty of the most horrid mockery, and impious

a P. 21.

b P. 73.

c P. 74.

jesuitical

jesuitical equivocation, may yet, if they will, repent; and by a speedy repentance avert the just vengeance of God, whom you yourself represent as LONG-SUFFERING, *i. e.* forbearing punishment in hopes of amendment, being not willing that any should perish, but that all should repent, and be saved. But how is this consistent with your doctrine of absolute decrees, denial of free-will, and universal grace offered to all, who will lay hold of it? &c.

BUT if we are guilty of horrid mockery, and impious jesuitical equivocation, because we subscribe to the 17th article in a sense different from what you are pleased to impose on it, what must be the guilt of THOSE, who, while they subscribe to the 15th and 31st articles, which set forth in the strongest terms the satisfaction made by Christ to be "for ALL the sins of the whole WORLD;" to the 16th, which declares that "after we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given;" and to the 23d, which declares that "it is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of preaching, before he be lawfully called by men, who have public authority to send ministers into the Lord's vineyard;" yet openly assert that Christ did not die for all men; that once a child of God, always a child of God; that it is impossible to fall from grace; and take upon them to preach publicly, being authorized only by their own presumption and self-sufficiency?

But

But I beg pardon; the ELECT, who maintain these positions, and countenance these practices in direct violation of the articles they subscribe to, ~~CAN~~ NOT be guilty of any thing horrid, impious, or jesuitical.

To the same cause I must attribute another instance of your partiality and prevarication. Having in page 72. and 73. of your first edition collected and summed up the whole force of your arguments in favour of election, perseverance, justification by faith alone, assurance of salvation &c. and represented the contrary doctrines as “ the avowed tenets of the church of Rome, which were abhorred by our first reformers as being DOCTRINES OF DEVILS, and LIMBS OF ANTI-CHRIST, which caused the chaste spouse of Christ to separate from the Babylonish whore” you cry out — “ From whence are we fallen? and how justly may we be alarmed at the great increase of popery in our land?” and close the whole with this tremendous exclamation — “ Alas! the doctrine of transubstantiation is an harmless error, compared with that which would make the almighty spirit of God dependent on the will of the fallen creature.” You persist in the same sentiments in your 2d edition, and pronounce the same anathema against those subtle serpents, who hold these doctrines. And yet notwithstanding all this, in a note (p. 82. 2d edition) addressed, I suppose, to some particular friends, who countenance
your

your irregular practices of lay-preaching &c. and join with you in abusing the clergy; whom therefore “^a you look upon to be partakers of that “ electing love, which in words they deny;” you tell them “ I would not be understood to intimate “ that believing the doctrines of personal election “ and final perseverance is essential to salvation; “ being well assured that there and have been, “ many eminent Christians, who hold universal “ redemption, and falling from grace,” and endeavour to soothe those gentlemen by informing them that the words which seem to bear so hard upon those who deny election and perseverance are NOT YOUR OWN — what a ^b puritanical evasion is this? In your defence of sovereign grace, you go still farther, and represent this as a “ ^c controversy about a point no ways necessary to salvation.”—Pray, sir, what can all this mean? The same tenets, it seems, are doctrines of devils in us, and quite harmless in them; we are “ the bitterest enemies of true godliness, and limbs of “ ant i-christ,” but they are “ real followers and “ disciples of the same blessed master.” We are apostates for differing from you on these points, and shall be damned with unquenchable fire: they may hold what they please with a safe conscience, being partakers of that electing love, which in words they deny.

^a Defence of sovereign Grace, p. 39.

^b Ibid. p. 4.

^c Ibid. p. 3.

ANOTHER

ANOTHER point yet remains, which you have the assurance to tell the world was an article of accusation against these six Students, viz. “^a that they “ hold the influences of the Holy Spirit necessary “ to constitute every one a child of God.” I have already confuted the base calumny, which was suggested to you, not by the spirit of truth, but by the father of lies : You cannot but know that we all hold the necessity of grace, and of the assistance of the Holy Spirit, and teach, that without this assistance we can do no good thing. Most of us have not only offered these petitions for the inspiration and comfort of the Holy Ghost in the^b desk, but from the University pulpit also, and I may challenge you to produce an instance, during the whole time of your residence in the University, of one, who dared to assert before that learned and religious body “^c that it is a proof of frenzy and enthusiasm to believe God will vouchsafe an answer “ to them.” But while we pray for the Spirit, and teach others to live under his holy influence, we distinguish between the extraordinary inspiration which was conferred on the Apostles and first Christians, and the ordinary grace of the same Spirit, which was vouchsafed to them, and is still to all good Christians in general, to enable them to work out their salvation. Which is it then, which you and your disciples claim ? If only the latter ; what folly, what presumption is it to com-

a P. 63.

b P. 66.

c Ibid.

pare the case of these young men with that of the Apostles and our blessed Saviour himself? I wonder not at all at Mr. *Whitefield*, but stand amazed to find “^a a Master of Arts, of near twenty years “standing in the University” argue in this manner— “Jesus the carpenter was bred to a trade.” Pray, fir, consider whom you are speaking of—the Son of God himself; ^b who received not the spirit by measure: ^c and in whom dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead—*Luke* the physician and ^d painter, *Matthew* the publican, *Paul* the tent-maker”—Persons immediately commissioned and inspired by God—were most, if not all of them, bred to trades—therefore any man may now, without any such extraordinary commission or inspiration, leap from the shop-board into the pulpit—“They were most “of them deficient in the learned languages”—No, they were not; they had the gift of tongues to supply the want of education, they spoke all the languages of the known ^e world. Will these men pretend to have the same gifts? Their examination proved they had not. —“They all used extempore prayer”—and therefore persons ignorant and uninspired may now take upon them to utter whatever comes uppermost in prayer to God Almighty, in the name of the congregation. —“But

^a P. 16.

^b Joh. iii. 35.

^c Col. ii. 9.

^d Of this you have no better proof than some legendary writings and relicts in popish chapels. Besides, painting is a liberal art, especially when united with that of physic. ^e Acts ii. 5, &c.

“ St.

" St. *Paul* was a notorious promoter of this kind of " prayer"—not this kind ; in St. *Paul*'s time spiritual gifts abounded in the Church ; many Christians then prayed and sang with the spirit : ^a St. *Paul* directs them how they should use these gifts to the edification of the Church ; but this can give no pretence or encouragement to ignorant persons, to pour forth extempore prayer in the congregation without either spirit or understanding.

If these persons, who have unhappily fallen under our censure, claimed only the ordinary grace and influences of the Holy Spirit, how came they to think themselves authorized or qualified to preach or expound, as they call it, and to offer up prayers of their own in a mix'd congregation ? The ordinary grace of the spirit gives men no new faculties : it only assists and prospers us in the use of natural means, and in the exercise of our ^b natural

^a 1 Cor. xiv.

^b You desire me to explain what I mean by our natural abilities ; probably you will be better pleased with an explanation in the words of Archbishop *Grindal*, taken from that letter, to which you have on another occasion appealed — " This gift of " expounding and interpreting the scriptures was IN St. PAUL'S " TIME given to many by special miracle without study ; so " was also, by like miracle the gift to speak with strange tongues, " which they had never learned. But now, miracles ceasing, " men must attain to the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin tongues " &c. by travel and study, God giving the increase ; so must " men also attain by like means to the gift of expounding and in- " terpreting the scriptures." Archbishop *Grindal*'s letter in
Strype's

or acquired abilities. How then could these men without education, and without knowledge, totally deficient in every part of learning, take upon themselves these offices, which a long and laborious course of education and study is generally thought necessary to qualify men for? Prayer in particular is a serious and important duty — “^a Be not rash with thy mouth, faith the preacher, and let not thine heart be hasty to utter any thing before God; for God is in heaven and thou upon earth.” When we come before the great Majesty of heaven, even in private prayer, we should do well to consider before hand both the matter and form of what we have to offer; and take particular care that we offer nothing unlawful, indecent, or improper. Much less can prayers be made in a public congregation with any propriety or decency, without a pre-composed and well digested form. If persons uninspired and untaught, without knowledge, or premeditation, take upon them to be the mouth of the congregation, and in their name offer up their own crude conceptions to the great God of heaven, to call this the sacrifice of fools, is a very mild appellation. The Church of *England* has sufficiently testified her disapprobation of extempore prayer by appointing a liturgy or form of public prayer, and requiring all her ministers to use this form, and none other: to put up therefore such extempore prayers

Strype's appendix, p. 81. — Had I seen this passage before I had written my book, I could not have more aptly expressed the sentiments of the Archbishop.

^a Eccles. v. 2.

in

in mixed congregations or conventicles, wherever they are held, is to act contrary to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of *England*. And accordingly our divines have constantly maintained and defended the necessity and expediency of public forms of prayer, and shewn the absurdity and indecency of the usage of extempore prayers, against the puritans and dissenters, whose practice and language (notwithstanding the high veneration you profess for the doctrine and discipline of the established Church) you and your friends adopt. The enthusiasts in the last century, who overthrew our constitution both in Church and State, talked of sitting down, and waiting for the spirit, bragged of the influences of the spirit, and particularly of the gift of prayer, they spoke disrespectfully of our liturgy, and so it appeared on the examination that some of these gentlemen had done; they condemned all public forms of prayer, and called it stinting and limiting the spirit: and they also pleaded the example of Christ and his Apostles; but I don't remember that any of them ever urged the example of " ^a the poor, old, blind " beggar, *Bartimeus*."

I MIGHT pursue you through every article of your comparison, and expose the absurdity (I had almost said ^b blasphemy) of it, were I not sensible that the ludicrous manner in which you have

^a P. 70. ^b I know not whether exposing the character of our Saviour and his Apostles to ridicule and contempt be not a more horrid species of blasphemy than even that charged upon Mr. *W.*
treated

treated those sacred characters cannot even be thought of without abhorrence.

I SHALL take notice of one point more, which you have touched on, and that is the DOCTRINE OF ASSURANCE, whereby the children of God are said to be assured of their salvation. You are pleased to say "^a that the denial of this assurance, " except by revelation, is the very doctrine of the " Council of *Trent*, and a main pillar of popery. If the Council of *Trent* denied this doctrine of assurance, so did it also the errors of *Arius* and *Socinus*; and you may as well call the denial of the one a main pillar of popery, as of the other. For though both these doctrines are, I fear, held by some Protestants, yet are they contrary to the doctrine of our Church. Our articles hold that men may fall from grace, and therefore no man can be infallibly sure of his perseverance. Our first reformers, as we have seen, ^b held, that neither scripture, nor the writings of the fathers teach any such knowledge or certainty.

You have favoured us with no proof of this your doctrine of perseverance, I shall therefore content myself at present with referring you to Dr *Randolph's* ^c sermon on Rom. viii. 16. lately pub-

^a P. 32.

^b 81.

^c Had you read the above sermon you would not have treated it with contempt, but you have the art of confuting, as well as quoting, books which you have never seen.

lished. Our *Margaret* Professer hath there shewn, that to do the works of God is the only mark of being God's children; that we can have no assurance of being such, but from the testimony of our consciences, joined to that of the Holy Spirit: that as to the perseverance, it must depend on our own free choice, and therefore we can have no infallible assurance of it; and that the doctrine of such assurance is a false and dangerous delusion. The same doctrine has been delivered by Bp *Sherlock*, almost in the same words with those of the first reformers in their chapter on faith³, which is worthy the serious consideration of all them, who talk so vainly and boast so confidently of their salvation. "Truthe it is, say they, "that in the sacramentes instituted by Christ, we "may constantly beleve the workes of God in "them to our presente comforte, and application "of his grace and favour, with assuraunce also, "that he will not fayle us, if we falle not from "hym. Wherefore so contynuinge in the state of "grace with hym, we may beleve undoubtedly to "be saved. But for as moche as oure owne "frayltie and noughtinesse ought ever to be feared "in us, it is therefore expediente for us to lyve "in contynuall wache, and contynuall fight with "our ennemyes, the dyvell, the fleshe, and the "worlde, and not to presume to moche of oure "perseveraunce & contynuance in the state of

a See "a necessary doctrine and erudition for any Christen
"man. Page 3.

M

" grace

“ of grace, whiche on our behalf is uncertayne and
 “ unstable. For although Goddis promyses made
 “ in Christ be immutable, yet he maketh them
 “ not to us, but with condition, so that his pro-
 “ myse standinge, we may yet fayle of the pro-
 “ myse, bycause we kepe not our promyse. And
 “ therefore yf we assuredly reckon upon the state
 “ of our felicitie, as grounded upon Goddis pro-
 “ myse, and do not therewith remembre, that no
 “ man shal be crowned, onlesse he lawfully fyght,
 “ we shall triumphe before the vyctorye, and so
 “ loke in vayne for that, whiche is not otherwise
 “ promised, but under a condition. And this
 “ every christen man must assuredlye beleve.” We
 must therefore ^a prove our own selves, and examine
 into our own lives and conversations, and if, ^b on
 an impartial enquiry, our hearts condemn us not,
 then have we confidence towards God. You, sir,
 I suppose, are possessed, or imagine yourself pos-
 sessed, of this assurance, and are confident that you
 are one of the elect people of God, one of his
 children, his sheep——But this is not the bleating
 of sheep, which we hear. Let me ask you se-
 riously, whether, to throw out personal abuse, ^c to
 rip up private characters, to revive old stories,
 many of them false, all of them misrepresented, of
 supposed abuses and want of discipline, thirty or
 forty years ago; to use bitter and opprobrious lan-
 guage, to call those who differ from you ^d a pes-

^a 2 Cor. xiii. 5.
 21, 79.

^b 1 Joh. iii. 21.

^c P. 6, 19,

^d P. 33.

tilent, seditious sect, holding pride-soothing doctrines, ^a doctrines of devils ; ^b dangerous heretics, and scismatics, incendiaries in the Church ; to cast general reflections on the most respectable members of the University, where there are ^c many great dignified divines, who are seen napping at the University church most Sundays throughout the year, and cannot find time to leave the common room, and attend the evening prayers at chapel ; and on the clergy, ^d many of whom spend their time in idleness and sensual indulgence, and carry ^e on a solemn farce of subscribing to articles, which they no more believe than they do mother Goose's tales. — Let me ask you, whether such language as this is consistent with that charity and meekness, which is the distinguishing character of Christ's disciples. ^f You seem indeed sensible that you have declared your sentiments too plainly : and therefore would vindicate yourself by the example of our blessed Saviour, and *Martin Luther*. As to *Luther*, let me desire you to imitate his many good qualities, and not his failings. He has been censured as guilty of too great heat and acrimony in some of his expressions ; but when you honoured him with the title of the COURAGIOUS CHAMPION OF THE REFORMATION, you had surely forgotten that he comes under the same condemnation with us, “ of holding the doctrines of “ free-will, and universal redemption, the avowed

a P. 52.

b P. 69.

c P. 71.

d P. 67.

e P. 74.

f Ibid.

“ doctrines of the Church of *Rome*, compared with
 “ which transubstantiation is an harmless error.”

—How will you reconcile these inconsistencies?
 But I am very sorry you should shelter yourself
 under the authority of our blessed Saviour. When
 you can shew that we are all of us “ the bitterest
 “ enemies of true godliness,” or that you have the
 same authority, as our Saviour, and the same
 knowledge of the heart, then we will give you
 leave, if you find reason, to call us scribes, and
 Pharisees, hypocrites. As you cannot do this, we
 must beseech you rather to learn from our blessed
 Saviour ^a meekness, and lowliness of heart; and
 to ^b put away from you all bitterness, and wrath,
 and anger, and clamour, and evil-speaking with
 all malice.

WHEN you complained so bitterly of persecu-
 tion, and compared the proceedings against these
 young men to those of the star-chamber, and high
 commission-court, you should have considered how
 you could acquit yourself, and your friends, of
 the same charge. Who persecuted *Barrett*, and
 others, and would fain have imposed the *Lambeth*
 articles upon them? the Calvinists at *Cambridge*,
 whose cause you espouse and defend. Who framed
 the horrible decrees of the synod of *Dort*, and
 deprived the remonstrants of all ECCLESIASTI-
 CAL FUNCTIONS, AND ALL OFFICES IN ANY
 UNIVERSITY: drove the learned *Grotius* into ba-

^a *Mati.* ix. 29.

^b *Eph.* iv. 31.

nishment.

nishment, and made him fly for his life? Your friends the Calvinists, whose proceedings you mention with approbation. Who persecuted, nay, horribly executed the Quakers? The good Calvinists of *New England*^b. And may we not add, that the same spirit of persecution still continues among them; since they will not suffer a Bishop of the Church of *England* to set foot there, for the discharge of an office purely spiritual, and without any pretensions to temporal jurisdiction? Your friend Mr. *Whitefield* in his letter to the Vice-Chancellor seems willing to encourage this spirit of his Calvinian friends, and invidiously calls the Bishops destined for *America*, Lords Bishops. Nay: you yourself would impose your own sense of the articles on us, and would sentence all those who deny your doctrines to be rejected as heretics, excommunicated, and expelled the University, and you urge the execution of that sentence *ipso facto* in the true spirit of your admired author Mr. *Prynne*, with an — “Alas! — Quid leges sine moribus vanæ proficiunt?” though indeed you tremble for the consequences; and are afraid our colleges would be in danger of an utter desertion, and an almost general expulsion ensue. What right then have you to complain, were we even to do by you, as you would do by us? We have deprived these men of no preferment, or emolument. Nor should we

a P. 57. b See the first Letter to the Author of the Confessional, p. 43.

c P. 66.

have done thus much, or even enquired what their tenets were with regard to these points, if they had not been charged with other matters, for which they ought to have been removed from a society devoted to true religion, and learning; viz. frequenting, and holding conventicles, insufficiency, ignorance, misbehaviour to their tutor &c.

AND here it will be necessary to obviate an objection, which you have magnified in such a manner as to lead some of your readers to conclude that these men were EXPELLED for holding such doctrines, as are at least disputable, and about which I have confessed that wise and good men have differed. Was this the real case, I confess you would have reason to complain, and the world might justly think the sentence not only severe, but illegal and arbitrary. Let me then again repeat, what I have before declared, that the legal or statutable cause of their expulsion was their having ATTENDED ILLICIT CONVENTICLES, PROHIBITED BY THE STATUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY. Most of them had indeed aggravated this crime, by assuming to themselves the character of preachers in such illicit conventicles, and one of them had dared even to officiate as a clergyman in a parish church. A farther aggravation of this crime was that they were most of them illiterate mechanics, who had intruded themselves into the university, for which they were neither designed nor qualified; and what still added to the propriety and expediency of putting the
the

the statute in force against them was their notorious connexion with the methodists, both in principles and practice; and in this view their tenets were considered, together with the very indecent manner in which they broached them before their tutor; who had reason to complain of them as Archbishop *Whitgift* did, “ of those new fangled and factious
 “ sectaries, whose endeavour is to make divisions
 “ wherever they come.” And truly, to use the words of the same prelate, “ ^a how shall the peace or
 “ safety of the Church (or University) be procured,
 “ if a few persons, so meanly qualified, should be
 “ countenanced against the whole state of the clergy
 “ of greatest account for learning, steadiness, wis-
 “ dom, religion and honesty; and open breakers,
 “ and impugnors of the laws, young in years, proud
 “ in conceit, contentious in disposition, be main-
 “ tained against their superiors and governors, seek-
 “ ing to reduce them to order and to obedience?
 “ Hæc sunt initia Hæreticorum, & ortus atque co-
 “ natus schismaticorum male cogitantium, ut sibi
 “ placeant, ut præpositum superbo tumore con-
 “ temnant: sic de ecclesia receditur, sic altare pro-
 “ phanum foris collocatur; sic contra pacem Christi,
 “ & ordinationem atque unitatem Dei rebellatur.
 Cyprian Epist. Lib. 3. — Such was the expostula-
 tion of *Whitgift* on a like occasion, who adds far-
 ther, (in his letter to the lord treasurer, vindicating
 his proceedings against those sectaries) “ ^b my ene-

^a *Strype* Appendix, book III. Numb. x.

^b *Ibid.* Numb. xi.

“ mies,

"mies, and the evil tongues of this UNCHARITABLE
 "SECT, report also that I am revolted, become a
 "PAPIST, and I know not what; but it proceed-
 "eth from that ungodly zeal which cometh not ex
 "amore sed ex livore (*i. e.* not of love but of envy)
 "wherewith they are possessed; and I disdain to
 "answer to such notorious untruths, which not the
 "best of them dare avouch to my face." I need
 not direct the reader in the application of this pas-
 sage, the resemblance is too strong to be mistaken.

THOUGH I am not obliged to take any
 notice of your postscript, it being addressed
 to a person totally unknown to me, yet as it con-
 tains, what you call, "three very material points,
 "on which you ground the cause you have defend-
 "ed, and to which you publicly call for an answer"
 — (tho' you might have done this with greater pro-
 priety, had you put your name to your perform-
 ance) I beg you will accept the following.

FIRST, From the foregoing account of the pro-
 ceedings, it will evidently appear that you have
 greatly misrepresented very many "facts relative to
 "the trial of the young men;" whether thro' want
 of information or candor, must be left to your own
 conscience, and that Being to whom you so solemnly
 appeal.

AFTER you had said all the ill-natured things
 you could invent, you give the reader to under-
 stand

stand that you could have said a great deal more, and compliment your own moderation by telling him "that you have rather extenuated than aggravated." This may be a beautiful figure in rhetoric; either hyperbole, or aposiopesis, or something superior to both — however, I hope, the candid reader will consider it only as a flower of speech, and weigh your moderation and forbearance "in the balance of calm reflection, and unbiassed judgment."

WHAT you mean by "the haughty overbearing treatment the youths met with at their trial," is beyond my comprehension. Sure I am, that the Vice-Chancellor and his assessors treated them with the greatest candor and humanity: and if any of the vast croud, which were present, behaved improperly, it was matter of great concern and offence to them; but can with no more justice be laid to their charge, than any noise, which may happen in the assize-hall, can be to the Judge who sits on the bench. But, in fact, the young men met with no ill-treatment from any one during the whole examination, which was carried on with as much decency as could be expected, in a place so crowded. The only circumstance, which gave offence, was the great throng which pressed into the chapel to hear the sentence, not with that reverence which became the place; but their behaviour in it was proper and decent, and a perfect silence was observed.

observed during the whole time that the Vice-Chancellor pronounced the several sentences.^a

I KNOW not what “veil you pretend to draw “over the moral characters of certain persons who “were very active against them,” but am convinced that you would have acted with more christian charity, had you honestly exposed what you pretend to conceal — you now stab in the dark, and your obscure insinuations reach much farther than an open attack could possibly have done. If you have any charge against the moral character of the Vice-Chancellor, or either of his assessors, you ought, in justice to the rest, to have openly avowed it. I flatter myself they have no reason either to sue to your mercy, or to “dread your power of exposing “them.”

WHAT has been above advanced concerning the doctrines of the Church of *England*, will, I hope, be a sufficient reply to the former part of your second point. “I wonder how you can ask what I “think of *Barret*’s case, and whether all persecution is confined to primitive times.” For an answer to this very extraordinary question I refer you to page 148. — the 3d point deserves none — But if you still persist to demand why Mr. *Newton*,

^a N.B. The Vice-Chancellor intended to pronounce sentence in the Hall, where the examination had been taken; but finding it greatly crowded, it was proposed to adjourn to the chapel to avoid that inconveniency.

Davies,

Davies, and *Fletcher* (for I don't remember that the other names were mentioned) were called methodists; I refer you to Mr. *Higson* for an answer.

BE pleased likewise to accept the following solution of your queries.^a

1st, THE testimony of Dr. *Dixon* was not set at nought, but had all the weight, which could with justice be given it. When particular facts were urged and proved, which by the statutes of the University, and of the Hall, subjected the offenders to expulsion, the Visitor was obliged to put those statutes in force, unless he would betray the duty and authority of his office. No testimony to their characters could alter the nature, or destroy the force of the proofs brought against them — For an answer to the latter part of this query, and to your 2^d — I refer you to Mr. *Welling's* case page 59 &c.

By way of solution to the third, I beg leave to assure you that the young men were not obliged to accuse themselves. When the articles of accusation were produced against each of them separately, they were asked whether they acknowledged what was urged against them to be true. If they did — no farther proof was required. If they did not — Mr. *Higson* then proceeded to support his charge, article by article; and he did it with the greatest

^a P. 84.

regularity,

regularity, and clearness imaginable. If you do not chuse to acquiesce in this account, I must refer you to him; who has all the evidence by him, and is ready to produce it, whenever he shall be properly called upon. I will only observe that, had they been questioned in the manner you represent, it is no more than what is usually done, when young men are accused of any irregularity before the governors of their respective societies. Something more than a bare denial is required; they are expected to answer to the charge, and to vindicate themselves by refuting, or disproving, the matter of their accusation — was not this the case, it is impossible that discipline could be maintained.

IN the conclusion of your reply, you have advanced no less than three and thirty queries, which you desire may be resolved. Though you have no reason, while you go masqued, to expect any notice should be taken of you, yet for the sake of satisfying the reader, I shall set down the following answers to them.

I. WHETHER Mr. *Higson* ever laboured under an insanity of mind, I know not; but this I know, that at the time of the visitation, he was in his perfect senses; and Mr. *Griffin* a near relation of Dr. *Dixon*, a person of the best character, and reputation, who had lately been Mr. *Higson's* pupil, and was then a member of *Edmund-hall*, bore testimony to his worth and excellence, and to the un-
common

common care and diligence, with which he had always discharged the office of tutor ; and Dr. *Dixon* himself has since confirmed this testimony.

II. THE grounds and motives of Mr. *Higson's* complaint are contained in his depositions made upon oath ; to which I refer you, p. 18.

III. FOR an answer to this I refer you to Mr. *Higson*. Though if it be true, you yourself have represented, what you here call a religious qualm, to be a state of insanity.

IV. FOR a solution of this, see p. 195.

V. FOR a solution of this, see p. 13.

VI. WHETHER Mr. *Higson* ever employed a curate who had been of a very mean occupation, and much more ignorant than any of the expelled members, must be left to him to answer, the assessors having no concern in it. Mr. *Higson* is the proper person to vindicate his own character.

VII. IT is a fact that a copy of the articles of expulsion was denied the young men, and that I justified this denial by pleading the custom of courts of judicature, and particularly alluded to the case of Mr. *W—s*. Not that I was obliged to have recourse to any court of judicature for the justification of what was entirely at the option of the Vice-Chan-

Chancellor; who might have pronounced sentence *viva voce*— without committing it to writing at all. If therefore a court of judicature may deny a copy of indictment, with much greater right may a visitor deny a copy of his sentence, who is not tied down to the same rules and forms of law.

VIII. IT is NOT fact that one who had been convicted of open blasphemy, infidelity, and drunkenness, was admitted an evidence against the young men. No charge had been brought against Mr. *W—g* when he was called in evidence, and Dr. *Dixon* himself at that time had no objection to his character. But for a full confutation of this 'base calumny, I refer the reader to p. 68.

IX. IF by PREFERENCE you mean, that Mr. *W—g* was punished in a less degree than the religious young men, I acknowledge it, and need not repeat the grounds of this proceeding, having already sufficiently explained it in p. 63.

X. & XI. I NEVER knew that Mr. *Higson* or any other clergyman had signed Mr. *W—g*'s testimony, neither should I have known that he had taken holy orders, had not you informed me of it. The Vice-Chancellor was not consulted, neither was his advice ever asked in relation to the testimony you allude to.

XII. YOUR

XII. YOUR twelfth query is the same with your ninth, and has already been answered. But I must farther observe that this affidavit was not admitted merely as an atonement for his crime, but a declaration of his real principles.

XIII. FOR the reasons of Mr. *Middleton's* expulsion, see the Vice-Chancellor's sentence, p. 31. But his behaviour was so far from being very regular that it was part of Mr. *Higson's* accusation against him.

XIV. THERE was only one person accused besides those who were expelled; and he was dismissed though illiterate, because he was not charged with having attended illicit conventicles, and declared that he had no design of going into orders. See p. 27.

XV. WHETHER Mr. *Higson* enquired into the characters of others, I know not, but he certainly did into that of Mr. *W—g*. See p. 67.

XVI. DR. *Nowell* did affirm that the young men
 “ were of no foundation, had no free-hold in the
 “ University, nor received one shilling profit from
 “ the hall;” and he acknowledges himself to be
 mistaken in the instance of the Bible-clerk, who,
 he is since informed, held an exhibition of FIVE
 POUNDS PER ANNUM from the Ironmonger's
 company.

XVII. MR.

XVII. Mr. *Kay* was not examined, and therefore the Vice-Chancellor and assessors could not form any judgment of his scholarship: but if we may believe Mr. *Higson*, he was a very MODERATE scholar. The examination, which you say Mr. *Middleton* passed so HONOURABLY, was such that a school-boy would have been deservedly corrected for. Mr. *Grove* was represented by his tutor to be a very INDIFFERENT scholar: but was not examined, because his tutor said, HE had been diligent in his endeavours to improve himself; which was not the case of the others.

XVIII. For an answer to this quere, I refer you to Mr. *Higson*.

XIX. For answer to this, see note, p. 55.

XX. I AM well informed that Mr. *Atterbury* was only one of many electors on that occasion, among whom were some of YOUR FRIENDS, and that the person so recommended by THEM was soon after expelled from *Christ Church*, for insufficiency and misbehaviour.

XXI. IT is not fact that Mr. *Jones* was condemned upon the testimony of a letter STUFFED WITH FALSHOOD, for he himself acknowledged principal facts contained in it, see p. 24. And the letters against Mr. *Grove* and Mr. *Middleton* were
either

either from very respectable members of this University, or from persons of well known credit and reputation.

XXII. For a satisfactory answer to this query see p. 72. Dr. *Dixon* has since informed us that the usual place of Mr. *Grove's* preachment was not in a BARN, but on a COMMON, so that his offence was only more open, and committed in the face of the sun.

XXIII. It is a fact that Mr. *Middleton* was put down guilty of denying the necessity of GOOD WORKS, notwithstanding the gloss which both you and he chuse to put upon his tenets.

XXIV. Mr. *Kay* was accused of holding the doctrines of absolute unconditional election, and infallible assurance; which I deny to be the doctrines of the reformation, for the reasons alledged, p. 74, 133 &c.

XXV. This article is the same as the 23d, and has received its answer.

XXVI. It is not fact that the clergymen you mention were spoken of with great contempt; they were introduced only as having had the tuition of these young men, and being reputed methodists.

XXVII. For a full answer to this article, see p. 55.

N

XXVIII.

XXVIII. & XXIX. For an answer to these, see my postscript.

XXX. It is not fact that Mr. *W—g* was one of those who was persuaded by the Vice-Chancellor and the Heads not to leave the Hall, that he might recover the credit of that house from the odium of methodism. Mr. *W—g* was not one of the original petitioners, which you well know, and therefore this unjust sarcasm could proceed only from the malevolence of your own heart. For my own part, instead of persuading Mr. *W—g* not to leave the Hall, I think the Principal inexcusable for not expelling him, if he was convinced he was a noted infidel.

XXXI. This query is introduced with a malevolent design to blacken the character of the University. You must know, that however you yourself, (for, as you pretend to speak from your own knowledge, I am obliged to include you in that number) or some other dissolute young men may have violated the rules of chastity and sobriety with impunity, this impunity was more owing to their good fortune in not being detected, than to the connivance of the University magistrates. That all have not so escaped, will appear from the black list of delinquents kept by the Proctors : whose arduous and laborious office has for the most part been executed with proportionable vigilance and resolution.

XXXII. For an answer to this query, see p. 82.

XXXIII. In

XXXIII. IN reply to your last quere, which you very POLITELY desire I would answer UPON MY WORD AND HONOUR, because you “strongly suspect that the articles of expulsion ESPECIALLY, “had undergone a little dressing and cooking up “since the memorable day of expulsion.” I beg leave to tell you, UPON MY WORD AND HONOUR, that my minutes received no other alteration, than what was necessary to fill up the abbreviations &c. in which they were, and I suppose all minutes generally are, taken for the sake of expedition — but that their substance is exactly the same — I had before assured you that the sentence was, word for word, the same with that pronounced by the Vice-Chancellor, and I now repeat that assurance, which you had no reason before to suspect. If you still want farther satisfaction, and will favour Dr. *Durell* or me with your company, we will not only shew you the original, but assist you in collating the manuscript with the printed copy.

ONE word more in answer to your N. B. and I have done. When it was said that the young men had their tutor’s advice in every step they took, as well in their meetings at first, as in their absenting themselves from them afterwards, Mr. *Higson* explained this matter, by declaring that Mr. *Jones* had imposed upon him in his representation of these meetings — that he neither mentioned expounding or extempore prayers; but only asked whether there

was any crime in a few friends meeting to read the holy scriptures, and other godly books. I am not surprized that Mr. *Jones* should deceive his tutor, when ^a you have endeavoured to impose the same account upon the world ^b.

WHATEVER Mr. *Grove*, Mr. *Middleton*, or you may be inclined to think, I am fully persuaded that the Vice-Chancellor was not pushed on by the violence of others, but urged by an affectionate regard for the honour and welfare of the University “to carry matters to the lengths they were carried;”—with reluctance indeed to the natural sweetness and humanity of his own disposition, but with that steadiness and impartiality, which became a scholar and a magistrate. Nor are you more happy in the proof by which you would support your assertion: his humanity does not stand in need of your compliment at the expence of truth. I am not conscious to myself of having asked any prying or impertinent questions, but such only as directly tended to discover, what I was appointed to enquire into, the truth; nor did the Vice-Chancellor ever stop me in

a P. 14, 15.

b In your second edition p. 24. you represent me as insinuating “with a sneering laugh” that Mr. *Jones*’s defence of himself should be remembered to his prejudice. In confutation of this unjust reflection I refer you to my minutes of Mr. *Jones*’s examination page 30. from whence it will appear, that I have faithfully recorded the substance of his defence. By the same minutes every other charge brought against me stands confuted.

fuch

such enquiry; but I have the satisfaction to say that my conduct, as well as that of the other assessors, met with his entire approbation. Both he, and they were indeed sensible that they were engaged in a very invidious office; and that their proceedings, however upright and impartial, would be censured, and misrepresented, by those, who should be affected by them. They could not expect to escape the sharpness of your resentment, who have not spared even the place of your education. Reverence and affection will naturally induce every true son of our *Alma Mater*, to be tender of her reputation, to honour her virtues, and put the most favourable construction on her failings. But you have taken an ill natured pleasure in exposing, with no less falsehood than malice, what, even had it been true, humanity would have endeavoured to conceal. Her lenity, which probably yourself have experienced, has not less provoked your indignation on other occasions, than, what you are pleased to call, her severity and cruelty on this. You have revived the long-forgotten disgrace of some of her members, and raised scandalous reports of others, merely to blacken her character, and bring upon her the reproach of the public.

I SINCERELY forgive any injury you may have intended to do me, but I know not how you will forgive yourself for that done to the University. Whatever zeal you may pretend for religion, while you bridle not your tongue, I have the authority of
an

an apostle to pronounce, that your religion is vain — Whatever assurances you may flatter yourself with of God's grace, if you have not charity, you deceive yourself — however you may fancy that you feel the impulses of the Holy Spirit, yet you will do well to remember that hatred, wrath, strife, evil-speaking, slander &c. are not the fruits of THAT Spirit.

THAT God would grant both you and me by his Holy Spirit to have a right judgment in all things is the hearty prayer of,

Sir,

Your most obedient,

humble Servant,

St. Mary-Hall,

March 3d, 1769.

T. NOWELL.

POSTSCRIPT.

I WAS in hopes you would at least have favoured the world with your name subscribed to your REPLY, and that I should have had the pleasure of addressing myself to you in a more particular manner in THIS postscript; putting you in mind of some circumstances which I cannot yet mention with propriety, lest I should be mistaken in the application of them. But, though publicly called upon, you still chuse to lie concealed, and shoot your arrows in the dark. — You tell the world, that “it is not shame, but you hope a better motive which makes you conceal your name.”

THE ^a ostentatious title prefixed to your reply, would not indeed permit you to attribute any part of your conduct to shame, or to any other MODEST motive; which you were so sensible of, as to banish that word from your title page, though it had appeared in your advertisement. I have already taken

a GOLIAH SLAIN.

more

more notice of that performance than it deserved ; the doctrinal points advanced by me are with great deference submitted to the judgment of the candid reader ; nor am I at all afraid of the imputation of PAPIST or PELAGIAN, or any other opprobrious name by which you or your friends may think proper to distinguish me. My life and conversation from my first admission to the University have, I thank God, been blameless and irreproachable, my enemies being the judges ; and, if I am not mistaken in your person, you yourself can (if you will) bear testimony to one instance of my zeal for religion and virtue on a particular occasion, and stand reproved by it. Your conscience surely must smite you, when you represented either the *Margaret* Professor, or me, as “ living a mere animal, flesh-
“ pampering life ; ” which, I may without vanity say, can be as little applicable to us as to any two persons, not only in the university, but in the kingdom. His learned and pious labours are too well known in the world to need any enumeration of them here ; and my whole time from my early youth has been devoted to a laborious but honourable employment ; which, I flatter myself, I have discharged with fidelity and diligence. Nor have I in the mean time been negligent in my ministerial function, in which I have laboured with a pure conscience, not for filthy LUCRE’s sake, having never received a farthing from the revenues of the church ; nor been paid so much for my service as I expended in the necessary performance of my duty, or laid out

out for the benefit of those to whom I ministered. I may appear vain in this confidence of boasting, but you have compelled me ; and the candid reader will pardon this defence of my character ; which has the plea of an honest necessity. So much in general.

THE particular charge against the Vice-Chancellor and his assessors, of their having passed an illegal arbitrary sentence on the young men, stands confuted by your own confession. — You ^a admit, and Mr. ^b *Grove* has admitted, that the meetings which they attended were illicit, and prohibited by the statutes of the university. — Let the statute itself speak the rest, §. 34. Stat. Aular. “ Quod si
“ quis hæresin, vel pravum aliquod dogma, contra
“ doctrinam vel disciplinam Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ
“ defenderit ; vel CONVENTICULIS ILLICITIS
“ interesse præsumperit ; ab aula EXPELLATUR,
“ & Domino Cancellario denunciatur.” — There remain some points yet to be considered before I take my FINAL leave of you : these respect the conference with Dr. *Dixon* at the present Vice-Chancellor’s lodgings ; in which the following particulars were discussed.

FIRST, Dr. *Dixon* was asked whether he did not, previous to the citation, request the Vice-Chancellor, that Dr. *Fothergill* and I might be of the number of the assessors ? He declared that he made such a request.

^a a REPLY, p. 29, 22.

^b Ibid, p. 66.

SECONDLY, Being asked, whether he had given you authority to say that he was ready to make oath that the Vice-Chancellor had absolutely declared, "that neither the expelled gentlemen were to be re-admitted, nor any others be suffered to leave the hall" he answered, that he was ready to make oath that he UNDERSTOOD the Vice-Chancellor to have so declared. Upon which Dr. *Durell*, in the presence of us all, desired to be admitted to his oath, in confirmation of the account of this whole transaction given by me in p. 69. The Vice-Chancellor and every one present agreed that his solemn declaration was sufficient, and therefore declined administering the oath. Dr. *Durell* in farther support of what is there related, urged his own constant practice on like occasions, and mentioned several instances of his permitting members to leave his own society though they had no such plea as was urged in this case; and one in particular which happened at the very time this affair was in agitation.

Dr. *Randolph* was next desired to declare his sentiments, who said, that he did not remember every particular that had passed at that meeting. He remembers that it was proposed to use all means of persuasion to induce those gentlemen to continue in the Hall; but is very sure it was not proposed to compel them. Nor could he look upon the determination of the Vice-Chancellor and his assessors with respect to their petition to be final, knowing that they had no right to make any such determination,

tion, there being a statute in this case provided, which prescribed the method of proceeding in these matters.

THE Vice-Chancellor then applied to Dr. *Fathergill*, who said that some time after the meeting Dr. *Dixon* asked him whether he did not understand that the resolution of that meeting had been final; he said, he did think it was agreed that the petitioners should not remove, and thought to have heard no more of it. But afterwards upon perusing my book, he went to Dr. *Dixon* and informed him that he had read my account of this transaction, and that he recollected, that though we had agreed to make use of persuasion to induce the petitioners not to leave the Hall, and were of opinion, that it would be highly proper for them to continue there; yet it was added, that in case they still persisted in their resolution, the Vice-Chancellor would then be obliged to speak to Dr. *Dixon*, and proceed as the statute directed; or words to that purpose. He added, that he had made it his business to acquaint Dr. *Dixon* with this circumstance as soon as he recollected it, to prevent any misrepresentation of it in consequence of what he had before said on the subject.

I NEED not tell you what were my sentiments; they are fully expressed in my relation of this transaction, but it will be proper to add what the present Vice-Chancellor observed, viz. that though at a meeting of the heads of houses, in which the reasonableness of the petitioners request was agitated, I had expressed my disapprobation of
their

their removal in the strongest terms, and offered many arguments against it, yet I never pretended that the determination of the Vice-Chancellor and his assessors had been final; which I certainly should have done, had I not been convinced that it neither was, nor could be final. Before I conclude this article, I cannot help observing that you have destroyed the evidence of Dr. *Dixon* and Mr. *Grove* by making them contradict themselves. In your *P. O.* you make them declare “that the Vice-Chancellor “had given them his solemn promise that the petitioners should not be permitted to leave the “Hall UNLESS the expelled members were re-admitted.”—Which implies that BOTH might take place. — In your reply you make them ready to swear that the Vice-Chancellor declared, “that “NEITHER the one should be re-admitted, NOR the “others suffered to leave the Hall.” Here, sir, is a contradiction in terms, which is sufficient to invalidate the force of any evidence whatever.

THIRDLY, Dr. *Dixon* was asked whether he himself suspected, or had given you the least ground to insinuate, that the Vice-Chancellor and his assessors had been tampered with, or *influenced*, from any quarter whatever, to pronounce sentence, against the persons accused. He answered, that, had he been to chuse for himself, he could not have appointed four persons in whose integrity he could better confide; and that he was persuaded that they had been influenced by no consideration whatever, except

except that of their conscience ; and he attributed the sentence they had pronounced **SOLELY** to their not being so well acquainted with the characters of the young men as he himself was. The late Vice-Chancellor, and the assessors then present, solemnly declared that they had received no intimations whatever from **ANY QUARTER**, and that they were directed **ONLY** by the dictates of their own conscience, and the force of evidence produced at the examination. I beg therefore that you will confess this to be a groundless suspicion, or produce your authority in support of it.

FOURTHLY, Dr. *Dixon* was asked whether he approved of the illiberal abuse, which you have so plentifully thrown out upon the persons of the Vice-Chancellor, and his assessors in particular, and on the university, the bishops, and the whole body of the clergy in general. He answered, that he was extremely sorry that any thing of this kind had happened. And added, that he had commended the candor of my book to ^a **YOUR FRIENDS**, and told them, “ that the spirit in which you had written “ could never do any service to your cause.”

^a I apprehended from what passed at the conference, that these words were spoken immediately to you, and have therefore inserted them as such in my note, p.10. But Dr. *Dixon*, to whose perusal I submitted this postscript, assures me that they were spoken to some of your friends. I beg the reader will correct it in that note, being unwilling to lead him into the most trifling mistake.

LASTLY,

LASTLY, He was asked whether he approved of the doctrinal tenets advanced in your book. And I have the pleasure in justification of Dr. *Dixon* to assure the world, that he declared his sentiments on these points to the following purpose. "I believe," said he, that the redemption by Christ was universal, and that no person shall be judged at the last day but for the wilful neglect of the means of salvation freely offered to him by God, and for disobedience to those commands which he had it in his power by grace to perform: so that every person shall have reason to acknowledge that his sentence is just." Sorry I am that you have had an opportunity of gaining credit to your cause by the sanction of his name; which however is merely accidental, and not the consequence of his attachment either to your sect or principles. I think myself obliged to mention these particulars to undeceive the generality of the world, who may have reason, from your representation, to imagine that he is connected with that set of people, which, under pretence of being GOD'S ELECT, despise the ordinances, and break through the established discipline of the Church.



E R R A T A.

P. 41. l. 8. from the bottom, for *Queen* r. *Queen*

121. l. 9. from the bottom, for *propositions* r. *proposition*